

Radio broadcasting and the quest for democratic participation on *Motsweding* FM

T.G. Mokgosi



orcid.org/0000-0002-6441-8567

Thesis accepted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Communication at the North-West University

Promoter: Dr. N. A. Tshidzumba

Graduation: 28 May 2021

Student number: 16131738

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own original work. It is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Communication at the North-West University (Mahikeng Campus), South Africa. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

tgmgokosi

Type text here

.....
Thabo Godfrey Mokgosi

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my late grandparents Mr. Badirile and Mrs. Mmamogofu Mokgosi, my late cousin Mmakedisang Mokgosi and friend in deed and needs Mr. Mosiame Mereotlhe. I believe, as an African that your invisible and invaluable spirit is and has been my fortress throughout this journey.

ABSTRACT

The study seeks to explore the role played by *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs programmes-*Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* as an avenue for citizen participation in the democratisation process. It interrogates more broadly the sometimes oblique relationship between public service broadcaster and democracy and attempt to deepen our understanding of the democratic role of the public broadcaster by examining how the two programmes, particularly through its discussion segments encourage citizen participation. The study utilises theoretical frames drawn from participatory liberal democratic, Habermasian public sphere, empowerment and Anthony Giddens' (1984) structuration theory to demonstrate the significance of the application of the concepts in the critical appreciation of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in providing citizens with the platforms to democratically participate in debating matters of common interest.

The examination of whether *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes provides important content attributed to mediated public sphere such as: surveillance of the socio-economic and political environments, providing platform for robust, uninhibited and wide-open marketplace of ideas seeks to establish how the contents of this two programmes contributes to citizens' democratic life. The study adopts thematic content analysis of the programmes' episodes to interrogates how *they function* as a mediated public sphere. The findings of the study have established that these news and current affairs programmes attempt to encourages citizen participation and public debate through call-ins and Facebook messages. The interpretation and analysis of data reveal that the act of participation falls short of deliberation, which is an essential precursor in examining radio broadcasting's role in fostering the space for citizen participation and empowerment.

Key words: Radio Broadcasting, Public Sphere, Democratic Participation, Empowerment and Radio Talk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would sincerely like to thank those who made valuable and useful contribution to my study. I owe gratitude that surpasses human comprehension to numerous individuals who stood behind me during the most difficult and challenging period of the doctoral research journey. Dr J. Hungbo, who guided, processed and refined my study at an initial stage. I understood the true meaning of what it means when they say, *“for gold to be gold it has to go through furnace”*. *I thank you*. The North-West University’s Human and Social Science Higher Degree Committee members as well as my compatriot, School of Communication’s post-graduates’ students’ both Masters and Doctoral studies for the level of engagement during my proposal presentation. I thank you all for your valuable contribution. I am also indebted to Dr A. Tshidzumba whose efficient supervision and robust engagement marked the completion of the study as well as Mr J. Moletsane from the Department of English who spent sleepless nights and valuable time proofreading and editing this dissertation to ensure that it conforms to academic language and style of presentation. I further owe the following individuals heartfelt gratitude: My Mother, Ms M. Mokgosi, the one and the only uncle, J. Mokgosi, young mother, M. Makganye and my young mothers and siblings, I thank you all for your unconditional support.

Acknowledgments wouldn’t be complete without *Motsweding* FM’s News and Current Affairs Producer, Mr. B. Korogo and Ms Refiloe Seboko for giving me their precious time for interview. I also owe my continuous debts to my friends and research assistants; Mr and Mrs. Puoeng, Mr and Mrs. Mokgantshang, Mr. and Mrs. Molefe, Mr. Dikoma, Mr. Lebe and Mr. Rakgomo. Honestly, I would have lost heart without their immeasurable support. In case, I forgot to thank anyone whose contribution to this work should be noted, I plead amnesty from the depth and breadth of my heart. I hadn’t consciously omitted you.

ABBREVIATIONS

PSB	Public Service Broadcasting
ICASA	Independent Communications Authority of South Africa
ECA	Electronic Communications Act
SABC	South African Broadcasting Corporation
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
SVT	Sveriges Television -Swedish Public Service Television Company
NRK	Norsk rikskringkasting commonly known as Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation
SMS	Short Message Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	
Declaration	i
Dedication	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations	vi
Table of Contents	
CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTATION	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background and The Context of the Study	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem	4
1.4 Research Questions	7
1.5 The Objective of the Study	7
1.6 The Rationale of the study	8
1.7 The Structure of the Study	10
1.8 Summary	13
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Public Service Broadcasting Characteristics and Democratic Participation	14
2.2.1 The Principle of Impartial Space for Free Expression and Open Debate	28
2.2.2 The Principle of 'Plurality and Diversity'	32
2.2.3 The Principle of Universalism	35
2.3 Talk Radio's Characteristics and Its Contribution to Citizen Debate	36
2.3.1 The Use of Indigenous Language in Radio Broadcasting	45

2.4 Radio Broadcasting, Democratic Participation and Citizenship	50
2.4.1 Political Efficacy and Citizenship Participation on <i>Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele</i>	56
2.4.2 Radio broadcasting, Democratic Participation Effects and Civic Education	58
2.4.3 Radio News, Exposure and Democratic Participation	67
2.4.4 Summary	71
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
3.1 Introduction	72
3.2 Radio Broadcasting and Participatory Liberal Theory	72
3.3 The Habermasian Public Sphere Theory and Radio Broadcasting	81
3.4 Radio Broadcasting and Empowerment Theory	87
3.5 Giddens' Structuration Theory and its Implications to Public Broadcasting	94
3.6 Summary	100
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
4.1 Introduction	102
4.2 Mixed Method Research Methodology	102
4.3 Determining the Type of the Case Study	104
4.4 Study Population and Sampling Techniques	106
4.5 Data Collection Methods	109
4.5.1 Tools for Data Collection	111
4.6 Thematic Content Data Analysis and Presentation	113
4.7 Validity and Reliability	114
4.8 Ethical Consideration	115
4.9 Summary	117

CHAPTER FIVE: *BORESETSE AND TSELE LE TSELE* NEWS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS PROGRAMMES AND THE FORMATION OF MEDIATED DEMOCRATIC PUBLIC DISCOURSE

5.1 Introduction	118
5.2 The Structure and Agenda Setting Strategy of <i>Boresetse</i> and <i>Tsele Le Tsele</i> News and Current Affairs	118
5.3 <i>Boresetse</i> and <i>Tsele Le Tsele</i> News and Current Affairs and The Limits of Debate	124
5.4 The Guest/Expert's Contribution in the Public Sphere	128
5.5 Impromptu Interview and The Limits of Debate	130
5.6 Summary	130

CHAPTER SIX: MEDIATED DEMOCRATIC PUBLIC DISCOURSE, ACCOUNTABILITY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY

6.1 Introduction	132
6.2 Political Discussion	132
6.2.1 Discussing The Land Issue	143
6.2.2 Discussing The State Capture	146
6.2.3 Discussing Socio-Economic Issues	148
6.2.3.1 Discussing Gender Based Violence and Children Abuse	150
6.2.4. Summary	164

CHAPTER SEVEN:

7.1 Reflections, Conclusion and Recommendations	166
LIST OF REFERENCES	172

ANNEXURE A: Informed consent for participating in an interview	220
ANNEXURE B: Informed consent for tape recording	221
ANNEXURE C: Interview schedule	222
ANNEXURE D: Informed consent for participating in an interview	223
ANNEXURE E: Informed consent for tape recording	224
ANNEXURE F: Interview schedule	225
ANNEXURE G: Informed consent for participating in an interview	226
ANNEXURE H: Informed consent for tape recording	227
ANNEXURE I: Interview schedule	228
ANNEXURE J: Informed consent for participating in an interview	229
ANNEXURE K: Informed consent for tape recording	230
ANNEXURE L: Interview schedule	231
ANNEXURE M: Informed consent for participants	232
ANNEXURE N: Questionnaire for participants	233
ANNEXURE O: Data transcribed and translated from <i>Tsele Le Tsele</i> and <i>Boresetse</i> Radio programmes, <i>Motsweding</i> FM Archives.	239

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Respondents' view of the forms of participation on <i>Motsweding</i> FM's News and Current Affairs programs	123
Table 2: Respondents agreement to the statement: <i>Motsweding</i> FM's current affairs' interactive session is relevant to empowerment of citizens' in their everyday experiences of life in a democratic society".	150
Table 3: Issues covered on <i>Motsweding</i> FM's news and current affairs discussions	155
Table 4: Respondents rating of the level of engagement (discussion) of the issues mentioned above on <i>Motsweding</i> FM's news and current affairs	155

CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTATION

1.1 Introduction

The study examines the extent to which *Motsweding* FM, part of the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC), public service radio stations, broadcasts in quest for citizen's democratic participation. It seeks to examine the role played by news and current affairs programmes. *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* in the South African democratic process, against the background of a perceived crisis of democratic participation. The two news and current affairs programmes attempt to discuss important socio-economic and political issues of the day and listeners are invited to participate by expressing their views on salient public affairs. In view of the governance and political challenges besetting the SABC in the past 10 ten years Jacob Zuma's Presidency, the issues concerning citizen's democratic participation may have taken a back seat as the struggle for the soul of the public broadcaster unfold. The SABC is the mediated public sphere which exists to serve public interest.

Moreover, most of the citizen participation on public broadcaster in South Africa albeit being limited, they are focused on the SABC at macro level instead of operational level. This is crucial given that the SABC has about twelve public service stations which broadcast in eleven official indigenous languages. *Motsweding* FM is the largest Setswana Radio Station in South Africa broadcasting from Mahikeng with a weekly average audience of over three million listeners who look up to it as a source of education and entertainment. Its aim is to be the contemporary voice of Setswana-speaking audience and understanding South Africans who acknowledge and are proud of their cultural heritage (*SABC Annual Report, 2010-2011*). Thus, the study intends to assess citizen participation at the micro level.

1.2 Background and The Context of the Study

Motsweding FM, as a public broadcasting service radio, is informed by legislative and regulatory frameworks in fulfilling its public service mandate. It is the statutory entity whose existence and operations are governed by laws and regulations. For example, the Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (the Authority) has a statutory mandate in terms of the Constitution, the ICASA Act, the Electronic Communications Act (ECA) and the Broadcasting Act to regulate broadcasting activities in South Africa in the public interest. One of the Authority's main tasks is to ensure compliance by broadcasters with the terms and conditions of their License, the ECA, the ICASA Act, the Broadcasting Act and any relevant legislation and regulations (<https://www.icasa.org.za/uploads/files/Motsweding-FM.pdf>, Accessed, 15/02/ 2021).

The Broadcasting Act, No. 4 of 1999, sets out the Charter with which the SABC has to conform with. The responsibilities of the SABC in terms of its Public Service mandate are defined in Section (10) of the Broadcasting Act of 1999 which states, among others relevant to the study, that the public stations and channels must:

“make services available to South Africans in all the official languages; reflect both the unity and diverse cultural and multilingual nature of South Africa and all of its cultures and regions to audiences; strive to be of high quality in all of the languages served; provide significant news and public affairs programming which meets the highest standards of journalism, as well as fair and unbiased coverage, impartiality, balance and independence from government, commercial and other interests; include significant amounts of educational programming, both curriculum-based and informal educative topics from a wide range of social, political and economic issues, including, but not limited to, human rights, health, early childhood development, agriculture, culture, religion, justice and commerce and contributing to a shared South African consciousness and identity” (Government Gazette, No. 20042, 1999: 22).

The content of the Charter as outline above is converted to the license conditions to guide the operations of each SABC's public broadcast service station. The Charter, provide the corporation, in pursuit of its mandate and in exercise of its powers to deliver intellectually and emotionally appealing programming in culturally significant areas, to institute forums of debate and examine critically its own social, cultural and political contribution and maintain close ties with society (Blumler and Hoffmann-Rien, 1992: 213-214). *Motsweding* FM is characterised as a Public Broadcasting Service licensee of the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). *Motsweding* FM is accessible to its audience on the frequencies specified in the frequency spectrum licence granted to it by the Authority. According to the frequency spectrum licence, the radio station's coverage areas are: North-West, Limpopo, Free State, Gauteng and Northern Cape. The radio station's mandate is to provide a full radio spectrum service to its audience. In terms of the licences condition granted to the station, Clause 4.2 stipulates that: "The licensed service shall be a full-spectrum format". Clause 6.2.2 of the licence stipulates that: "The Licensee shall broadcast at least sixty (60) minutes of current affairs programming each day".

The Broadcasting *Act No. 4 of 1999*, the Charter of the Corporation and the SABC's Editorial Policy is the pivotal piece of legislation governing broadcasting in South Africa. The obligations and responsibilities of the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC), as determined by Parliament, are specified in the Broadcasting Act, No. 4 of 1999, as amended. The Act stipulates that the Public Service Broadcasting services should provide: "significant news and public affairs programming which meets the highest standards of journalism, as well as fair and unbiased coverage, impartiality, balance and independence from government, commercial and other interests" (SABC Annual Report 2011|2012). In terms of the Charter, the SABC, in pursuing its goals and

exercising its powers, enjoys the freedom of expression and of journalistic creative, and programming independence that is guaranteed by the Constitution of South Africa. The radio station's current affairs programmes involve interviews, live field reports, phone-ins and analysis of matters of public interest and broadcast for 60 minutes each (<https://www.icasa.org.za/uploads/files/Motsweding-FM.pdf>, Accessed 15/02/2021). The Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999, the Charter of the Corporation and the SABC's Editorial Policy and *Motsweding* FM's licence conditions have a profound impact on the degree to which *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes producers' decision making process and how they provide citizens with the platform to democratically participate in current affairs.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Motsweding FM news and current affairs programmes serve as crucial avenues through which citizens receive important socio-economic and political issues of common concern. Nevertheless, the coverage of such issues hardly provide adequate space for dialogue among citizens, and the ability for them to set agenda in discussing matters of common interest emanating from the news media. Heller (2009: 134) observed that South Africa has consolidated "its formal constitutional democracy, but its subaltern citizens are still unable to participate in shaping public issues" through direct input into the democratic debate, thus resulting in citizens' democratic deficit. The station's current affairs instead frame news "as a strategic game played by those in power" (Strömbäck, 2005: 339), which "limits and disables democratic participation" (Dahlberg, 2005a: 123). As a result, the station attempts to speak to power on behalf of citizens in a one-way, watchdog and mere representation of citizens' interests in a top-down approach. This approach fundamentally undermines citizens' ability to set agenda for public debate on matters of

common concern (Wasserman and Garman, 2014:396). The top-down approach to citizen's democratic participation is unsustainable as it has to be "built and sustained by the actions of a large number of citizens" (Strömbäck, 2005: 339). Putnam (2000: 341) reminds us "citizenship is not a spectator sport". Edelman (1988) observes that "news about 'public affairs' encourages the translation of personal concerns into beliefs about a public world people witness as spectators rather than participants". The inability to provide citizens with sufficient and effective platform to speak up their mind is tantamount to denying them voice. Cahn and Passet (1971: 31) contend that denying participation includes the opportunity to choose, to be heard, to discuss, to criticize, and to challenge decisions regarding the most fundamental conditions of existence, is to deny the individual's own worth and to confirm his impotence and subservience. This ultimately deprives citizens of their "democratic standing" of active citizenship (Brown, 1994: 890).

However, there is a substantial literature that suggest that the news media activate conversation by offering the citizens with conversational subjects of the day whereby they impart and exchange public affairs information, talk politics, form opinions and in doing so, participate in the political processes (Kim, Wyatt, and Katz, 1999: 364). Brundidge and Rice (2009: 147) argue that newspaper reading triggers political discussion, political discussion influences public opinion, and opinion in turn stimulates political action. Rojas et al. (2005) suggest the notion of "media dialogue" refers to the fact that "media consumption and talking politics" are an interwoven and inseparable process. For Carey (1989: 69-88), conversation is argument around the news, a discussion of the issues of the day and the back and-forth out of which a democratic citizenry appreciates itself. These standpoints suggest that news media at the heart to democratic talk. Thus, Chan, (2001: 115) concludes that contemporary democratic talk is by definition, a "mediated

democracy”, with the media serving as a means of expression and as a means of information. The public broadcaster’s responsibility in situations of inequality and conflict is not merely an attempt to voice the concerns of the public, but to engage in a reciprocal relationship of speaking and listening. It is not enough for the broadcaster to “give voice to citizens by telling their stories – it requires reciprocity of speaking and listening” (Couldry, 2010:7–11).

This demands *Motsweding* FM to adopt programming similar to what Bickford (1996: 11) calls “communicative engagement” in which citizens engage with one another. The view resonates with Buckley, Duer, Mendel and O’Siochru’s (2008: 33) argument that, where broadcasting is not only informative but participatory, “it can help to build capacities that contribute to a healthy governance environment, cultivating collaborative leadership capabilities, self-confidence, and collective engagement. The audience, includes those who are otherwise marginalised and without voice, can contribute to setting the agenda, express themselves, influence their community or society, and call for government action”. With respect to radio broadcast, citizens’ participation arguably has transformative effects for those who participate. For example, Warren, (1996: 225) notes that deliberation “mitigates the narrative vacuum into which individuals are drawn as they take up politicized identities. It can provide alternative narratives and more information, while often challenging simplistic stereotypes”. Thus broadcast citizen participation content that involves dissimilar views triggers “enlarged mentality” (Arendt, 1968: 241) and “enlightened understanding” (Dahl, 1989: 105), which are transformative and empowering in nature. Thus, public service broadcaster can facilitate information, public voice, and capacity local communities to participate in public debate on key development, can develop informed opinions, begin to form interest groups, and mobilise illiterate

communities to address common concerns. George Herbert Mead termed this fairly well as follows: “a highly developed society is one in which individual members are interrelated in a multiplicity of different intricate and interrelated ways” (Mead, 1934: 268).

1.4 Research Questions

The study sought to examine the extent to which *Motsweding* FM, part of the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC), public service radio stations, broadcasts in quest for citizen’s democratic participation and was guided by the following research questions (RQs):

R Q. 1. How efficient is *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in forming the mediated democratic public discourse?

R Q. 2. To what extent does mediated democratic public discourse as offered by these two programmes hold official to account on issues of governance within democratic society?

R Q. 3. To what extent are these programmes good democratic platform that provide citizens an opportunity to deliberate on issues of common concern?

1.5 The Objective of the Study

The research objectives, in general, describe what the study intends to achieve. As such, the following objectives were identified:

- To examine the efficiency of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* programmes in forming a public sphere in which citizens participate democratically in mediated public discourse.
- To determine the degree to which participation of listeners as offered by these two programmes is within democratic debates

- To establish whether the two programmes are good democratic platform that provide citizens an opportunity to deliberate on issues of common concern.

Hungbo (2013: 226) states that radio, like many other media forms, seeks to lay claim to empowering the less powerful through different program forms. The framing and structuring of such programs are often done in ways that at least pretend to give room for free and unhindered participation from the widest possible spectrum of society including the listenership. The right of participation is, therefore, one of the key aspects often cited in favour of radio as an agent for the promotion of social change and development (Wasserman, 2011). The above-stated objectives are rooted on the grounded that *Motsweding FM*, as a public service broadcaster, has to provide information needed to empower citizens to make informed decision. This point has often been a critical deterrent in the hands of radio enthusiast as a medium capable of societal transformation (Hungbo, 2013: 226). Radio broadcasting through audience access programmes, as a result, can contribute to the quality of democracy through mediating citizenship in a way that empowers citizens to exert influence over public decisions making processes through public debate.

1.6 The Rationale of the study

The first assumption of the study is based on the conception that central to democracy, is the citizens' ability to participate and "democracy is unthinkable without the ability of citizens to participate freely" in current affairs (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, 1995:1). The more a society is found on participation, "the better its citizens are able to rule themselves" (Bohman, 1990: 108). Healthier democracy thus, intensifies when "citizens are able to express their preferences to each other" (Memoli, 2011:82). Thus, the notion

of democracy becomes one of “the key sites of the articulation of the concept ‘participation’ because of its concern with the inclusion of the people within political decision-making process” (Carpentier, 2011:15). For example, Boeder (2000) argues, “the quality of a society depends on its ability and capacity to communicate within itself in a reasoned way”. For Cohen (1989) democracy is seen as an “association whose affairs are governed by the public deliberation of its members”. In other words, democracy undertakes an open platform in which citizens are allowed to contribute in influencing public debate.

Irvin and Stansbury (2004:56) argue that, “an in-depth citizen-democratic participation process can help to surpass the barriers created by our sound-bite media culture” inherent in journalism practice. In other words, sound bite constrains public debate due to its inability to examine the participants/ speakers’ view on issues expressed. Thus, the second assumption is based on the arguments that deep citizen participation often rest on the virtues of the process and the belief that an engaged citizenry is healthier than a passive citizenry (King, Feltey and Susel, 1998). As demonstrated in Delli Carpini and Keeter’s (1996) study, engaged citizens are better citizens judged by the standards of participation. The more *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes empower citizens to participate on socio-economic and political issues of common concern, the more citizens are likely to be motivated to take on an active role in a democracy (Verba et al., 1995). *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes are, therefore, together understood as an institutionalised process of communication, through which citizens democratically participate in discussing public affairs.

1.7 The Structure of the Study

The study is structured into seven chapters, which are briefly outlined as follow:

Chapter One introduces, the background and the context of the study. The study contextualises *Motsweding* FM within the *Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999*, Charter of the Corporation which govern its programming as a public broadcaster, which led to the statement of the problem and questions. The objectives of the study are outlined in relation to the research question. The chapter expounded in a nutshell the rationale for undertaking the study.

Chapter Two aims to locate the study of *Motsweding* FM as a public broadcaster and its reason for existence (mandate) funding model, governance model and challenges facing the public broadcasting institution. within the context of existing knowledge in public radio broadcasting and democratic participation. It drew on various arguments and different school of thoughts with focus on public radio broadcasting and democratic participation. The further juxtaposed the three concepts namely; radio broadcasting (mediated public sphere), democratic participation and *Motsweding* FM (public broadcasting) and the various arguments and different school of thoughts concerning the concepts. The impact of new communication technology and its role in facilitating democratic participation within broadcasting context is discussed. The chapter also interrogated the extent to which talk radio and indigenous language broadcast media and their place in strengthening the democratic process of society by enhancing public participation. The concepts of media and citizenship, the effects of democratic participation, citizen's political knowledge, political efficacy and exposure to the news media which are seen as major aspect of democratic participation are also discussed.

Chapter Three aims to interrogate the theoretical frames of Participatory Liberal, the Habermasian Public Sphere, Empowerment, Anthony Giddens' Structuration and Agenda Setting Theories and their implications to radio broadcasting, participation and democracy. The chapter dovetailed how these theories in the context of radio broadcasting, in particular *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in terms of being able to provide robust and discursive space in which citizens are able to participate in pursuit of healthy democracy. The public sphere is inherently related to deliberative democracy. The deliberative public sphere theorists expand the range of considerations and arguments, and thus foster citizens' understanding and expose them to multiple points of view. Theories of participatory democracy and deliberative democracy claim that citizen participation has positive effects on the quality of democracy.

Chapter Four presents research methodology and design used to investigate the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest of democratic participation. The methods applied in data collection, analysis and presentation are explained. The chapter further explains the population of the study, the sampling procedure and sampling techniques as well as ethical consideration. All the study is predominantly qualitative, mixed methods research, i.e., a research method in which the investigator collects, analyses, mixes, and draws inferences from both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or a program of inquiry provided a better understanding of research problems that either approach alone were used. In this way, the researcher was free to choose the methods, techniques, and procedures of research that best meet the needs and purposes of this study.

Chapter Five focuses on the analyses and interpretation of data collected. The chapter analysis and interpret guest or expert interview, vox pops (interviews with ordinary man and woman on the street), emailed interviews responses of *Boresetse* news and current affairs presenter, as well as qualitative interview with *Motsweding* FM Senior News and Current Affairs producer and producer of *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The presenters' role in setting the agenda for public discussion in both programmes is scrutinised. The audience also play a central role in talk or discussion programmes, as a result, audience phone-ins and social media text such Facebook messages read by presenters during the show are also be scrutinised in establishing their meaning.

Chapter Six focuses on the analyses and interpretation of the themes identified in *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs episodes during the period under investigation which ranges from socio-economic and political issues evident within the contents of archival recorded of the selected episodes in which. This chapter aims to present and analyse data by examining the democratic quality of everyday communicative practices on *Motsweding* FM current affairs, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* through which the public sphere is constituted.

Chapter Seven presents conclusion, limitations as well as recommendations. This research recommends, among others, to future researchers who might be interested in exploring media and citizen participation to look into 'focus group interview' with active participants (audience) to get in-depth understanding of what motivate them to participate in public affairs radio programmes rather than surveying the general audience. The study further concludes that although *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* provide space for citizens to participate in current affairs, the form and

shape of participation is silent in meeting the criteria of public deliberation. The findings of the study have established the deficiency of deliberation in *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs programs and the framing as well as management of citizen participation.

1.8 Summary

This chapter looked briefly at the introduction and background of the study which led to the statement of the problem and questions. The objectives of the study were outlined in relation to the research question as well as the rationale for undertaking the study. The chapter further introduced the research design and theoretical framework informing the study. Theories of participatory liberal democratic, Habermasian public sphere, empowerment and Anthony Giddens' Structuration theory were highlighted as the building block of the study. The theories acknowledge that citizens' participation is crucial for a well-functioning democratic political process.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to locate the study of *Motsweding* FM as a public broadcaster and its reason for existence (mandate) funding model, governance model and challenges facing the public broadcasting institution. within the context of existing knowledge in public radio broadcasting and democratic participation. It drew on various arguments and different school of thoughts with focus on public radio broadcasting and democratic participation. The further juxtaposed the three concepts namely; radio broadcasting (mediated public sphere), democratic participation and *Motsweding* FM (public broadcasting) and the various arguments and different school of thoughts concerning the concepts. The impact of new communication technology and its role in facilitating democratic participation within broadcasting context is discussed. The chapter also interrogated the extent to which talk radio and indigenous language broadcast media and their place in strengthening the democratic process of society by enhancing public participation. The concepts of media and citizenship, the effects of democratic participation, citizen's political knowledge and political efficacy are also discussed. The chapter concludes with the argument that democratic participation is associated with citizens' exposure to the news media of which radio broadcasting is usually seen as fundamental aspect of democracy.

2.2 Public Broadcasting Characteristics and Democratic Participation

There is no standard definition of what public broadcasting specifically is, although a number of scholars have attempted to state its key characteristics. The term broadcasting refers to the means of media transmission that makes information available to a broad spectrum of the population (O' Shaughnessy and Stadler, 2005:455). Public broadcaster on the other hand, entails broadcasting institution which is publicly owned (Curran 2002:

191). The public broadcaster's mandate is deeply rooted on classic Reithian (John Reith, 1924; the first CEO of the British Broadcasting Corporation) public service broadcasting principles. In the Reithian sense of the word and values, the public service broadcasting is characterised by "the provision of an impartial space for free expression and open debate; the provision for all interests and tastes; the provision for minorities; concern for national identity and community; competition in good programming rather than for numbers of audiences; the liberation rather than restriction of programme makers; universal accessibility and addressing audiences as citizens, not consumers' (cited in Scannell, 1990: 13-16). Arguably, public service broadcasting has contributed to this mandate to certain degree but it has persistently been criticised for not providing space for participation and neglecting the role related to dialogue (Moe, 2008: 319). The existence of public service broadcasting is profoundly entrenched in public service; it must broaden citizens' horizon and empower them to understand themselves without being influenced and pressured, and also avoiding propagating elitism (Kupe, 2006). The conception of public broadcasting is entrenched on the understanding that the "broadcasting spectrum is limited and belongs to the nation. The government, while it may act as the guardian of the nation-state, should be kept at arm's length from the day-to-day operation" of the broadcaster (Teer-Tomaselli, 1998: 1).

The notion of the 'nation state' as an "imagined community" depend on the role of the public broadcaster to make it possible for the citizens of the nation to contribute to the construction of public opinion (Gripsrud, 2002: 271). It is imagined because the *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* citizenry will never know most of their fellow-citizens, even meet them, or even hear of them, just like even members of the smallest nation, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion (Anderson (1983: 6). Thus, public broadcaster

becomes the “public good, belonging to the whole nation, not to be exploited for private or sectarian gain of either a monetary or ideological kind” (Teer-Tomaselli, 1998: 1). The dominant position in the public broadcaster’s mandate stated above prescribe two ideal democratic functions for the broadcaster, first, it should make important information available for all and, second, enable citizens to communicate with each other about relevant issues. The public broadcaster should both disseminate information and facilitate dialogue (Moe, 2008: 319). The broadcaster therefore, is expected to be shielded from state oppression and commercial coercion to fulfil those democratic functions. For both economic and ideological reasons, Teer-Tomaselli, (1998) contends

“The responsibilities implied in this mandate could only be performed by a state-regulated monopoly, that is, public broadcasting services. This was the rationale which governed public service broadcasting until the early 1980s. From that period, the global media landscape underwent fundamental changes as almost all countries deregulated broadcasting. National broadcasting systems were deregulated or, rather, re-regulated; private providers were admitted to the market; and the state facilitated and promoted the development of the technological infrastructure and was occasionally involved in its operation” (Teer-Tomaselli, 1998: 1).

Ideally, PSBs, are funded largely if not completely through public funds, are not susceptible to market forces, and are mandated to be impartial and fair on political matters. In short, PSBs are envisioned to help citizens get more of the information they need, particularly information that commercial broadcast media cannot or will not provide (Soroka, et al. 2012: 719 720). Within the context of public broadcasting, public funds historically comprised fiscus/appropriation and licence fees or a combination of the two. In many countries, McQuail (2005: 179) notes that, public service broadcasting refers to a “system that is set up by law and generally financed by public funds and given a large

degree of editorial and operating independence". Public service broadcasting of which *Motsweding* FM represent means a broadcasting system that is "non-profit and non-commercial, supported by public funds, ultimately accountable in some legally defined way to the citizenry, aimed at providing a service to the entire population, and one which does not apply commercial principles as the primary means to determine its programming" (McChesney, 1997:1). The universal justification for such systems is that "they should serve the public interest by meeting the important communication needs of society and its citizens, as decided and reviewed by way of the democratic political system (McQuail, 2005: 179). There is no agreement amongst scholars on which is the best position aligned to public interest principles. In fact, critics often find it easier to pinpoint what is not in the public interest, for example, too much violence in television or news that is too crime focused, than to explain what serving the public interests entails. Market enthusiasts, on the other hand, can point to a straightforward definition of the public interest by inverting the term: the public interest then becomes what the public is interested in. From this viewpoint, those media (broadcasters) that are popular, by definition, serve the public interest. The public broadcaster in this context serves the public interest to the extent that they embody the diversity of experiences and ideas in a given society (Croteau and Hoynes, 2006: 32-33).

The role of the public broadcaster is highly debated and highly contested terrain internationally, even more so in the context of societies undergoing social and political transitions. In this respect, the concept of democracy "...looms around discussions of media policy...practically in all platforms, both intellectual and political" (Nordenstreng, 2000: 29). From its inception, as Teer-Tomaselli (1998) observes "political and commercially powerful sectors of society expected public service broadcasting to

accomplish an important democratic and cultural mission. It was given the task of providing the entire population with information, education, and quality entertainment (Teer-Tomaselli, 1998: 1). In addition to information, education, and quality entertainment, public service broadcaster is devoted to reporting the news impartially, and to giving due prominence to coverage of public affairs. It thus ensures that people are briefed properly to exercise their rights and obligations as citizens and contributes to the healthy functioning of the democratic system (Curran, and Seaton, 2003: 396). In new democracies like South Africa, public broadcaster has a critical role to play in engendering democratic participation which is at the heart of its public mandate by educating and informing the public about the democratic process. This study defines 'democratic participation' in terms of "public debate" whereby ordinary citizens decide how individually as well as collectively they shall act and interact through mediated public sphere (Bennett, Flickinger and Rhine, 2000: 100-101). The notion 'participation' in its democratic perspective, means "the act of taking part in the decision-making process" that affect the well-being of the citizenry (Sartori, 1987: 113). In this way, the public broadcaster is assumed to perform a critical part in construction a democratic society by giving citizens' a platform to voice diverse opinions; in informing citizens of their rights and responsibilities, and cultivating their knowledge about the ways for them to participate in socio-economic and political processes affecting their lives and as such, the mass media, in particular, radio broadcasting is often considered a crucial component of the public sphere (Curran 2000, Dahlgren 2000, 1995).

Conceptually, the values of the provision of an impartial space for free expression and open debate as well as the provision for all interests and tastes (plurality and diversity) in public service broadcasting suggests that the right place for the public broadcaster is the

public sphere (Calhoun 1992; Garnham, 1993; Habermas, 1989; Thompson, 1993). The concept of 'the public sphere' in Habermas' logic is a theoretical resource that defines a "platform in contemporary societies in which political participation is enacted through the medium of talk. It is the space in which citizens deliberate about their common affairs, hence, an institutionalized arena of discursive interaction. This arena is conceptually distinct from the state; it a site for the production and circulation of discourses that can in principle be critical of the state" (Fraser, 1990: 57). The notion of political participation suggests a democracy where individual citizens have an obligation to "act in the political process beyond their personal interest" (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994: 9-35). The public broadcaster thus plays a meaningful role as it enables citizens to act in the political process when it affords them space to air their views, insights, and preferences, beyond their personal interest initially shared by a few which can also be found to be interesting and worthwhile by the majority. However, the centrality of the public broadcaster to the concept of public sphere in facilitating access to democratic public discourse and civic engagement, has been criticised (Wassermann and Garman, 2013; Couldry, 2009; Dahlgren and Sparks, 1991). Studies points to an increased fragmentation of the public sphere (Dahlgren, 2005) as well as an increased audience disengagement within the traditional news media (Wan, 2013) in particular with regard to younger audiences (Wasserman and Garman 2013).

On the other hand, Garnham (1990:120) admits that the actual practice of public service broadcasting is an imperfect realisation of the Habermasian (1989) ideal of a public sphere of deliberating by citizens. He is adamant about its superiority "to the market as a means of providing all citizens, whatever their wealth or geographical location, equal access to a wide range of high-quality entertainment, information and education. It also

serves as a means of ensuring that the aim of the programme producer is the satisfaction of a range of audience tastes rather than only those tastes that show the largest profit". In other words, it could be argued that the public broadcaster is inevitably 'embedded in networks of commercial and political power' (Couldry, 2010: 148). This always entails disastrous consequences for the nature of public broadcasting. The central argument here is that 'broadcasting as a medium suffers from "market failure" (Graham, 2001:1). In general, public service broadcasting has suffered, according to numerous accounts, from a loss of "legitimacy, under funding, declining audiences and a less clear sense of purpose" (Curran, 2002: 190). In the context of South Africa where communities are still geographically, socially and often politically marginalised, *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs mediated public forums, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* have the potential to play a key uniting role by giving members of these various "imagined communities" (Bosch, 2011a: 80) an equal opportunity to engage in public debate in languages spoken and understood by the majority of the people.

The democratic South African media landscape, in comparison to other post-authoritarian countries where media were seen to provide a platform to debate the scope and nature of the new democracy, was anticipated to shift itself towards civil society to undertake citizens' participation in the democratic process and for their voices to be heard (Murphy, 2007: 2). This take place in situations whereby the public broadcaster provides the platform in which "citizens feel that they are being listened to and responded to in a way that values and validates their identities and experiences to the extent that they can influence political decisions and policies through participation and engagement with democratic processes" (Wasserman and Garman, 2014: 396). The moment that citizens exchange views in public about how power affects them and how it should be organised,

a “space opens up which can be called political” (Coleman and Rose, 2010:142). In democratic systems, the question of boundaries between what is political and what is not is constantly raised. As Claude Lefort indicates,

“Politics exists only where there is a difference between the sphere where men recognize each other as citizens sharing a common world, and social life where they test their reciprocal dependence as a result of the division of labour and the necessity of satisfying their needs. The apparent expansion of the public sphere, or the tendency to bury the private in the public-as it has often been said-is just as misleading. The truth is that where the distinction between the private and the public spheres becomes blurred, both public and private disappear. What emerges is something that could be called ‘the social’, a vast organization or network of numerous dependent relationships, which is governed by a dominating apparatus” (Lefort, 1986: 64).

Although the term *politics* often refers to conflicts that ensue in and around government arenas like boards and legislatures, for the purpose of this study the term *politics* refers to an informal citizen’s interactions that take place in the radio broadcast debate. Thus, for this study, *politics* is defined as the exercise of citizen’s power, to get officials to do things they would not otherwise do, in overt ways, as in rules and laws, and in covert ways, such as through the development of powerful norms and understandings that direct behaviours (Gerstl-Pepin, 2007: 4). The ‘more people participate as citizens in politics, the closer one comes to the ideal’ of a public sphere (Schudson, 1992: 147). The contextual meaning of politics thus refers to citizens “acting and speaking together” about matters of common interest as equals in mediated public sphere (Arendt, 1958). As Walter Lippmann (1922) pointed out, politics is intrinsically a “mediated experience”. Thus, Fraser views politics as citizens “reasoning together to promote a common good that transcends the mere sum of individual preferences” (Fraser, 1990:71-72). In other words, the notion of the public sphere has drawn attention to “the character of talk” as a

constitutive feature of democracy (Williamson, 2011: 23). To this end, talk is appreciated as constitutive of publics, which is both morally and functionally vibrant for democracy.

However, given the importance of radio broadcasting in facilitating democratic public discourse and civic engagement, Garnham (1990: 111) contends that public service broadcasting in its actual historical function has shared values with Habermasian (1989) concept of a 'crucial failure' to recognise "the problem of mediation within the public sphere (as mention previously) and thus the role of knowledge-brokers within the system. In particular, the public service model has failed to come to terms with the proper and necessary function of both journalist and politicians. In relation to both groups, there is a failure to sufficiently distinguish between two communicative functions with the public sphere, the collection and dissemination of information, and the provision of forum for debate". These challenges make it difficult for public service broadcasting to fulfill Reith and Habermas' principles, particularly the principle of impartial space for free expression and open debate in favour of entertainment oriented programmes. For example, politically unpretentious public service broadcasting, unlike commercial broadcaster, will always be in conflict with the political culture preferred by the ruling elite. The most powerful individuals in democratic society who view the media as a treat to advance their dubious character and or interest turn to use public broadcasting for propaganda purposes. The appointment of the head of the public broadcaster becomes a disputed terrain. Generally, the consequences for the public broadcaster in democratic politics seem largely to be operating negative, in ways that promote apathy, cynicism, and quiescence at the expense of active citizenship and political participation (Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes and Sasson, 1992: 373). Even though public broadcasting service has been heralded for its democratic potential to empower citizen through their participation in democratic

discussion, its legitimacy is persistently threatened by commercial and political interests in terms of fulfilling its public service mandate. Moreover, throughout much of the world, public service broadcasting has been subject to a combined commercial, political and ideological assault. New private channels have come into being; new deregulatory regimes have been introduced; and new, hostile lobbies have been formed (Curran: 2002:190). In other words, the degree to which the public broadcasting is the sphere of informed public debate and the democratic promise that is always implicit in public broadcasting systems, as McChesney (1997: 1) contends are in “rapid retreat”. In his view:

The deterioration of public service broadcasting is the logical consequence of the worldwide neoliberal adoption of the market and commercial values as the superior regulator of the media. Neoliberalism is not merely a set of economic principles; rather, it is implicitly a theory of democracy. And the democratic system that works best with a market-driven economy is one where there exist widespread public cynicism and depoliticisation, and where the mainstream political parties barely debate the fundamental issues. In this sense, the attack on public service broadcasting is part and parcel of the current attack on all non-commercial, public service institutions and values. The corrosion of public service broadcasting can only be understood in this broader political and economic context (McChesney, 1997: 2).

Admittedly, the environment wherein the public broadcasters operate has shifted. The public broadcasters as originally envisioned by Lord Reith may no longer firmly hold. It is important that the study weave through these shifts. While the nation-state has been the terrain of public broadcasting, most of the dynamics which plague broadcasting are of international import and are the direct result of the intervention of the global economic world order, which threatens to undermine the very economic and political system under which public broadcasting presently operates: the nation-state (Teer-Tomaselli, 1998: 1).

McChesney (1997) also notes that the public broadcasting system faces a direct and constant threat from capitalist forces that seek to exploit the commercial potential of public broadcasting, and who regard public broadcasters as a barrier to their ambitions. This tendency is unavoidable. It stems out of the relentless pursuit of profit that is the hallmark of all capitalist economies. The trajectory is clear across the world: wherever public service principles are dominant; they eventually succumb to pressure to convert the broadcasting system to a largely commercial basis (McChesney, 1997: 17). In short, most commercial broadcasters treat audience as consumers, not citizens (Dahlberg 2005b: 170–2). This could arguably be one of the reasons why the public broadcaster continues to rationalise news and current affairs because of its funding model which requires that more time should be dedicated to commercially oriented programmes, hence the prioritisation of music and soaps. Thus, market-driven broadcast media tend to shrink news in favour of entertainment, offer 'infotainment' instead of informative analysis, and follow private and partisan agendas (Curran, and Seaton, 2003: 396).

Politically too, public broadcasters have been subject to direct censorship through restrictive laws and regulations; broadcasters have been encouraged to censor themselves in response to a variety of pressures (public criticism, private intimacy, information management, refusals to increase public funding, the threat of privatization or the loss of a television franchise); and journalists who cannot be intimidated have been summarily sacked, jailed or even killed (Curran: 2002-222). The SABC arguably experience similar during President Jacob Zuma era which saw the media being threaten with draconian laws. Consequently, in this atmosphere, the way in which the public is allowed to participate is heavily shaped by both commercial and political interests. In a nutshell, the market driven citizen democratic participation is likely to undermine 'critical-

rational debate' because participation in public life and/or political debate in a commercialized public sphere loses its independent critical edge and becomes more sensationalized and trivialized (Benson, 2009: 177). In fact, a commercial "marketplace" of ideas has a strong bias toward rewarding ideas that support the status quo and marginalizing socio-economic and dissident political views. In practice, the marketplace tends to reproduce social inequality economically, politically, and ideologically (McChesney, 1997: 29). The public broadcaster, despite being faced by serious political and economic challenges and criticism remains the most important democratic institution in which public debate involving previously marginalised citizens can be excised by voicing their concerns, especially in their indigenous languages which are often taken for granted by commercial media. It can be maintained that *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs discussion segment foster greater political interest, enlarged political knowledge and trust in the political system by attempting to maximise citizen participation in public affairs (Aarts, Fladmoe and Stromback, 2012).

The programmes respectively allow citizens to take part in talking about the everyday socio-economic and political issues shared among community members by influencing personal and public policy decisions making process and actions giving rise to those issues, and how to tackle them through mediated public debate (Bello and Wilkinson, 2017:29). It is therefore, useful to consider the role of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs as primary avenue through which the public receives information on socio-economic and political issues. The programmes' ability to collect and disseminate information, as well as the provision of forum for public debate becomes a part of contemporary political processes (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994: 9-35).

Another aspect that has been a threat to the traditional mandate of public service broadcasting (PSB), apart from the commercial logic and political pressure, has been new Information and Communication Technology (ICT), including the social media networks. In fact, they are not only threatening the democratic potential of PSB, but they are at the same time enabling and facilitating citizen participation in order to adjust to changes brought about by both neo-liberalism and digital capitalism. Siapera (2004), notes regarding the potential benefits of ICT that “the way of addressing the audience that broadcasters adopt on the web is deeply conservative; most channels have benefited from the technical advantages of online media in order to increase their knowledge of viewers and users, and to try to get them involved in various ways. Broadcasters make the most of the advantages presented by the web as a distribution system, in order to increase their market-share and explore new business models”. Audience participation could be considered as a feature of the public service function provided by broadcasters. The audience refers to a “series of relationships that are established among the media and the public which is deeply rooted in social and cultural values” (García-Avilés, 2012: 430).

The concept of audience participation shares a variety of meanings, defined in this context as the feedback which the broadcasters provide through a combination of traditional systems and new technologies. It thus encompasses tools such as commenting by SMS for a radio show, or calling in a talk show to give one’s opinion. (García-Avilés, 2012: 430). Phone-ins and new communication technology like Facebook messages are some of the prominent features of citizen participation on *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs. Livingstone and Lunt (1994) highlight that audience (citizens) participation on public broadcasting debate platform offer the space for publics’

discourses to allow citizens express opinions in their everyday life in relation to their own experiences. Correspondingly, comprehensive examination of the “constant shift from journalism as product to journalism as process”, Robinson (2011:198–199) discovered that journalists and audiences equally recognise, and respect, what citizens can contribute when news becomes a mutually shared process, requiring forms of ‘work’ from both groups. Tambini, (1999: 306) observes that “a very broad notion of democracy and participation is necessary to come to terms with the implications of new media” for democracy. The opportunities for citizen participation attainable by new media technology have resulted in “multi-platform formats” (Enli, 2008:106).

The term multi-platform formats designate the conjunction between mass media and personal media (Columbo, 2004). Digital technologies and their associated digital/participatory cultures both assist and encourage “end-user participation, challenging the socio-cultural rationale for professional control over such content creation, filtering, and distribution” (Deuze, 2006; Jenkins, 2006). In review of social media journalism, Hermida’s (2012) argues that as “Twitter and Facebook become reutilised elements of news work, the affordances and culture of social media are influencing how newsrooms are reporting the news, leading to discussions on key principles such as impartiality, verification and professional behaviour”. Enli (2005) and Syvertsen (2006) have illuminated how audience participation signifies a new source of revenue for broadcasters; “the financial potential in turning audiences into customers is a prominent motivation for furthering audience activity”. According to the study conducted by Enli (2008:112) on the participation policies of public broadcasters BBC, SVT, NRK and PBS, it was found that “these channels regard audience participation as a strategic element to face the challenges of the digital age, which represents a new turn in the

traditional policy of public broadcasters”. This digital revolution increases the potentials for “content distribution, but at the same time forces PSB companies to restructure and rethink their offerings – and increasingly also their identities” (Cola and Prario, 2012: 182). For example, Iosifidis (2010: 1) observed that “cross-platform strategies help public service broadcasting retain audience share, reach new audiences and develop on-demand services, while enabling them to create a stronger partnership with civil society and serve an extended form of citizenship”. At the same time, Scannell (2005) regards the possibilities of personalized media use provided by digitalization as a threat to traditional broadcasting. It has been argued that the much-heralded information society is decidedly not about to make politically useful information and cultural expression more available to people. On the contrary, technological advances have generated new interfaces between broadcasters and audiences market coupled with public policy have tendered to opt for private gain over the public interest (Dahlgren and Sparks, 1991: 11). From the perspective of the citizen, access to pertinent information will cost more and more, augmenting differentials in access and further eroding the universalist ideal of citizenship (Murdock and Golding, 1989).

2.2.1 The Principle of Impartial Space for Free Expression and Open Debate

Freedom of expression is democracy’s praxis. It is a right, but it implies responsibility and respect for the rights of others. Limits of freedom of expression are not constant – they are marked by its cultural and social context. But, there must be no doubt about where responsibility resides. Freedom of expression has legal, ethical and moral dimensions; ultimately, it is a question of the fundamental idea that all human beings are inherently equal. Public broadcaster is vital to freedom of expression. The presence of pluralism and independence of the public broadcaster are essential to democratic rule. Mass media,

public broadcaster, included have long been considered as central, shared sources of information, as 'watchdogs', and as fora of public debate – a public sphere – based on the nexus between media, democracy and civic engagement (Edström, Kenyon and Svensson, 2016: 20). Harrison (2006) states that the public broadcasting needs to be more than an "information forum"- it also needs to be a deliberative platform, a specific kind of "discursive interaction, an ideal of unrestricted rational discussion of public matters" (Fraser, 1990: 56-80). The principle of 'space for free expression and open debate' in the Reithian sense of the word and values are deeply rooted in the idea of public deliberation which fundamentally suggest that apart from entertaining and providing educational programmes, public service broadcasting institution should serve as the space in which democratic public deliberation is enacted through the medium of talk.

Burkhalter, Gastil and Kelshaw (2002) view public deliberation as a "combination of careful problem analysis and an egalitarian process in which participants have adequate speaking opportunities and engage in attentive listening or dialogue that bridges divergent ways of speaking and knowing". Thus, Gutmann and Thompson (1996) view deliberation as a particularly valuable kind of participation because only by deliberating together can audience as citizens discover mutually acceptable ways of resolving or learning to live with their moral disagreement. Fuchs (2007:48) argues that "it is only the fact that arguments are put forward by other people that generates the credibility that may induce a participant to change his opinion. In public deliberation, publics preferably discuss and make sense of public affairs, engage in self-expressions, shape, and articulate opinions and civic identities (Delli Carpini, Cook, and Jacobs, 2004: 315–344). The democratic value of public deliberation puts the strongest emphasis on *how* ideas

should be exchanged in the broadcast debate. "Deliberativeness is the core value of this perspective, and it involves recognizing, incorporating, and rebutting the arguments of others...as well as justifying one's own" (Ferree, Gamson, Gerhards and Rucht, 2002b: 222). In the context of mediated public deliberation, it means the systematic exchange of arguments by participants in the public sphere. Sartori (1987) believes that deliberation is vital to vigorous democracy, but that "its absence is notable in most democratic societies". Similarly, Hill and Hughes (1998: 62) maintain the view that deliberation is at the heart of democracy and citizen deliberation is usually seen as an indispensable characteristic of democracy. Radio broadcasting in South Africa, particularly (PSB), is significant as broadcasting is a crucial medium of the public sphere and central to the transition to democracy and the constant process of democratisation (Horwitz, 2001: 175).

Historically, public service broadcasting has occupied an institutional space that has some independence from both the economy and the state and potentially provides a national arena for a diversity of social groups to communicate with one another as well as addressing the public as citizens rather than consumers (Stevenson, 1993-1994: 236). This institutional space is considered to be a perfect social milieu where citizens discuss and debate socio-economic (social ills, labour etc.) and political (governance) matters of common concerns, access a wide range of information, and reflect and revise their understanding of those issues (Parkins and Mitchell, 2005: 530). Thus, PSB can undeniably be "presented as the institutional space which is best able to realise the principles of communicative action in the public sphere which are: freedom from commercial pressures, undistorted communication, consensual procedures, rational-critical debate and at least ideally the expression of social unity. Public service

broadcasting can be extolled because it is intended as a neutral space responsive to the interests of all in society, where matters of the public good can be debated, considered and ideally agreed upon” (Karppinen, Moe and Svensson, 2008:13). *Motsweding* FM’s news and current affairs discussion segment has the potential to stimulate citizens’ political action/ political participation by the process of citizens talking to one another (Katz, 1992: 80) or what Kim and Kim (2008: 63) commonly refer to as “everyday political talk and dialogic deliberation”. Morrell (2005: 52) contends that citizens who engage in mediated public deliberation get training for democracy and like practicing an activity develops one’s confidence in doing that activity, deliberation could increase citizens’ confidence that they can understand and participate in the political system. Deliberation through *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs’ may empower the citizen to feel for and become consciously a member of a great community with his fellow citizens. For instance, Barber (1984: 232) regards deliberation as “equipping citizens with a capacity for common vision”. Through mediated public deliberation, citizens thinking may maybe nurtured, they may learn to justify their claims, and thereby attain more sophisticated opinions. Thus, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs deliberation can just as undeniably become a lesson in unidirectional political persuasion and opinion reinforcement as it can become a tool for equipping of citizens’ minds (Brundidge and Rice, 2009: 147).

The public broadcaster’s role in this regard is to encourage democratic participation because levels of engagement in a democratic system have implications for the system’s parallel justness and acceptability (Kenski and Stroud, 2006; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993). In this way, public deliberation becomes a vital tool of a responsive and accountable democracy. To this end, deliberation through *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele*

news and current affairs arguably has the capacity to exert significant political influence by empowering citizens, invigorating and educating citizens and shaping the terms of debate and discourse in civil society about what is considered important (Jacobs, Cook and Delli Carpini, 2009:14). The opportunity to deliberate becomes conceivable to the extent to which citizens in modern democracy find the public broadcaster as a “discursive space for criticism learning, and new forms of association that can test the limits of their political beliefs” (Bohman, 1990: 109). At the very least, deliberative radio broadcast content would serve as a source of diverse opinions and associated reasons that citizens can tap on those occasions on which they actually do deliberate (Wessler, 2009: 6).

2.2.2 The Principle of ‘Plurality and Diversity’

The principles of ‘plurality and diversity’ are also crucial to the concepts of public service broadcasting system and democratic participation. The degree to which democratic participation is authenticity and substantive should be based on diverse and pluralistic views engaged by competent citizens. The principle of pluralism in the context of this study denotes radio broadcasting’s ability to reflect proportionately existing differences in society. This it achieves by giving equal access to divergent points of views thus offering a wide range of choice for individuals whereas diversity refers to the extent to which radio broadcast contents “reflect and serve various interests and opinions” of the public (Cammaerts and Carpentier, 2007: 11-13). The principle diversity’ refers, not only to differences in race, class, and gender but also to substantive political or ideological differences. Therefore, citizens should have access, among the diverse media fare, both to people and views that they find similar and to people and views that are very different from their own (Croteau and Hoynes, 2006: 35). In a multicultural society, the SABC needs to ensure not only that the diversity is reflected, but that it is reflected positively....

“programmes should contribute to a sense of nation building and should not in any way disparage the lifestyle or belief systems of any specific cultural group or in any way attack the integrity of such a group, unless it is established to be in the public interest. However, the news and beliefs of different groups are obviously open to honest, thoughtful scrutiny in programmes like documentaries” (South African Broadcasting Corporation, 1996: 10). In this context, *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs, as a platform for the expression of diversity, “the contestation of multiple positions, and the interfacing of many discourses” becomes a part of modern political processes (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994: 34). In other words, *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs may arguably contribute to public debate through its openness to diversity of perspectives existing in society.

The principles plurality and diversity require *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs to fulfil its public service mandate by giving citizens adequate exposure to the diversity of opinions, perspectives and values in society (Curran, 2002: 212). *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs thus contribute to diversity and quality in broadcasting by providing universal access to independent information, offering a platform for debate, and contributing to national culture and identity (Leurdijk, 2007: 71). Karppinen et al., (2008:13) contend that in a “political and cultural environment which has promoted difference and pluralism, arguments for public service broadcasting need to consider more fully the issues of pluralism and conflict. Such an understanding of the democratic role of the public service broadcasting informed by an agonistic model of democracy provides an alternative to both the singular proliferation of private media outlets and the outmoded view of public broadcasting”. This perspective acknowledges the view that conflict is inherent in human relations and is likely to manifest in public discussion. From a liberal viewpoint and in contrast with more community-centred or unitary views of

society, “pluralism and conflict are seen as fruitful and as being a necessary condition of human progress” (Cammaerts and Carpentier, 2007:11). Most researchers suggest that public talk must be deliberative, meaning that it must air disagreements, bringing into play a wide range of alternative perspectives and viewpoints.

In his study titled *“Why Conversation is not the Soul of Democracy”* Michael Schudson (1997) acknowledges that conflict is inherent in public conversation. He contends that “democratic talk is not necessarily egalitarian, but it is essentially public, and if this means that democratic talk is talk among people of different values and different backgrounds, it is also profoundly uncomfortable” (Schudson, 1997: 299). Sparks (1997:79) also argues that “conflict and disagreement”, can instead be transformed by citizen deliberation and action. Thus, conflicts and disagreement permits citizens to adapt to changing their perspective regarding the issue at hand. Acknowledging the possibility of conflict in public talk, Chantal Mouffe (1999) made the following comment,

“Modern democracy's specificity lies in recognition and legitimation of conflict and the refusal to suppress it by imposing an authoritarian order. Breaking with the symbolic representation of society as an organic body-which is characteristic of the holistic mode of social organization-a democratic society makes room for the expression of conflicting interests and values. To be sure, pluralist democracy demands a certain amount of consensus, but such a consensus concerns only some ethical-political principles. Since those ethical-political principles can only exist; however, through many different and conflicting interpretations, such a consensus is bound to be a “conflictual consensus. That is why a pluralist democracy needs to make room for dissent and for the institutions through which it can be manifested. Its survival depends on collective identities forming around clearly differentiated positions, as well as on the possibility of choosing between real alternatives (Mouffe, 1999: 756).

Motsweding FM's news and current affairs discussion segments can arguably serve as a source of such disagreement if their content is deliberative in the sense that they confront citizens with opinions contrary to their own and with reasons for those opinions. At the very least deliberative radio broadcast content would serve as a repository of divergent opinions and associated reasons that citizens can tap on those occasions on which they actually do deliberate. For citizens willing to deliberate, the existence of such a repository reduces information costs drastically and thereby facilitates deliberation (Wessler, 2009: 6).

2.2.3 The Principle of Universalism

Universalism mean provision of programming which covers a full range of genres, from information to education and entertainment, for the widest possible audience and covering the most extensive geographical spread. The drive of public service broadcasting is to be the provision of a universal service of excellent programming, while maintaining public legitimacy through an editorial independence from both the government of the day and rampant commercial interests (Teer-Tomaselli, 1998: 1). In the words of Graham Murdock (2005: 178), public service broadcasting should offer;

The chance to universalize the political public sphere by providing open access to three essential cultural resources of a full citizenry which are, comprehensive and accurate information about contemporary events and the actions power holders, access to the contextual frameworks that convert raw information into usable knowledge by suggesting interpretation and explanations, and access to arenas of debate where contending accounts, aspirations, and positions can be subjected to sustained scrutiny" through democratic discussion (Murdock, 2005: 178).

The idea of universalism in the values of public service broadcasting requires that "all citizens entitled to participate in the process of political dialogue [be present]" (Jacobs et

al, 2009: 10). However, in the digital age, and in the context of mass communication, the audience become present remotely and scattered across places where the station reach. Syvertsen (1999) posits, the main characteristic of public service broadcasters in the digital age might be “their capacity to address the entire nation, and thus stand in contrast to the commercial channels’ more targeted broadcasting”. The public broadcaster should therefore ostensibly concentrate its digital platforms activities on helping ‘the public to articulate its views’ (Coleman, 2004: 98). This argument has been advanced by Scannell (2005) who claims that public service is “the true meaning of broadcasting in the digital age: it [PBS] is not to be thought of in terms of some notion of the ‘value-added’ content of certain kinds of programme. It is much more to do with a communicative relationship between broadcasting and a new kind of general public” (Scannell, 2005: 141).

2.3 Talk Radio’s Characteristics and Its Contribution to Citizen Debate

Much of the work done on radio in Africa has focused on other aspects of radio like radio drama, music and community radio. However, talk-centric democratic paradigm shift has inspired scholars to begin investigating the democratic potential of talk radio which recognises the crucial part played by citizenry in modern African democratic societies prior and beyond elections period. Talk radio is resonant of a time when people had shared sets of values, when people gathered regularly to exchange information, especially on local politics and social issues, and reaffirmed their sense of belonging—even when belonging meant bitterly disagreeing over what was best for the community (Barone and Schrof, 1990: 51). Studies indicate that talk radio has been associated with increased general political participation, a sense of political efficacy, exposure to communication media and to monitoring public affairs content in media, perception of information concerning campaigns, and awareness of issues (Hofstetter et al., 1999: 354-

355). These studies demonstrate an important paradigm shift in contemporary democratic model from vote-centric to talk-centric philosophies of democracy (Delli Carpini et al., 2004). Talk radio as a format is characterised by conversation that is prompted by a “programme host and usually involving listeners who telephone to participate in the discussion about topics such as politics, sports or current affairs” (Rubin and Step, 2000: 636). *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs discussion segments share common characteristics with ‘talk radio format’ as the presenters serve this function by making certain news topics more salient than others, while putting a particular perspective on those topics (Brundidge and Rice, 2009: 148).

The principles of public broadcasting as outlined and discussed above within the context of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current genre play an essential role in the democratisation process by nourishing a more talkative political culture (Lee, 2007: 91). The two programmes have become *Motsweding* FM’s flagship for discussing important socio-economic and political topics of general concern and can thus be evaluated in terms of how well they express a diversity of public voices and challenge established power to recognise the complexities of everyday life (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994:35). In this sense, news and current affairs space on *Motsweding* FM is a unique form of public participation in the radio broadcasting and in political discourse (Crider, 2012: 228). They provide ‘an electronic public space’ with the potential to contribute to public debate in their own way (Herbst, 1995; Livingstone and Lunt, 1994). Hutchby (1996: 7) designates talk radio as “a space created at the interface of private and public spheres of modern society”. For Freund, the “private” and the “public,” are presuppositions of the political. In fact, Freund makes a clear distinction between the political sphere and other social spheres while restricting considerably the meaning of the term ‘public’

“The true political relation is public, and from this standpoint other social relations are said to be private.... The private and the public are ... also social relations; however, in one case, the relation is based on the autonomy of individuals in the sense that they have the freedom to adhere to a grouping, to leave it or to abstain from it, and in the other, the relation is based on the independence of the collectively as a whole, which is independent only with respect to other collectivities of the same type and which includes the relation of domination to subordination. The private is not the individual, that is, the specific relation of the individual with himself, but rather all of the relations within which he is but one individual among others” (Freund [1965] 1978: 292-293).

For Bosch (2011b: 207) talk radio is a “space for the formation of public opinion” and, more specifically, by demonstrating how 567MW “creates a space for the development of a public sphere within the context of deliberative democracy” in South Africa. Hofstetter et al. (1994: 468) suggest that talk radio serves as a “democratic forum diminishing political and social alienation, and increasing self-efficacy and participation”. The practice of citizens talking with other citizens in mediated public sphere like *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs is a form of participation and arguably affords the citizens with the opportunity to “develop and express their views, learn the positions of others, identify shared concerns and preferences, and come to understand and reach judgments” about matters of public concern (Delli Carpini et al., 2004: 316-19). Hence Lasswell (1941: 81) remarks that democracy, “depends on talk” and citizens talking to “one another about politics”, involves partaking in a common public life (Bennett et al., 2000: 101). Thus, talk among citizens is seen as “fundamental to – and an expression of - their participation” (Dahlgren, 2002:6-10). Accordingly, Hungbo (2013: 229) sees, talk radio as a dedicated space which individual citizens have to learn about and acquire the necessary knowledge for participation. This study is more concerned about discourse among citizens—that’s talking, discussing, debating, and/or deliberating. Discourse of

this kind as a form of participation. It thus makes sense to investigate radio broadcast news and current affairs' and its contribution to the South Africa democratic process through civic participation and public talk. Barber (1989: 355-356) views public talk as talk among a community of citizens about common issues, for example, the public good, a form of public thinking rather than private thinking, and it can be undertaken only in a public forum where a citizen debate and deliberate together and thus depends on participation in communities of engaged citizens.

Public talk is thus central to the notion of talk radio. Investigation on the influence of talk radio has focused on the nature of democratic participation, political and social alienation, and public opinion and political behaviour (Ross, 2004, Herbst, 1995). By participating in *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes debate, citizens become "public citizens who create a public domain in which they can govern themselves. It is only if citizens participate in the public domain can a strong democracy exist" (Michels, 2007: 333). Public talk through news and current affairs can therefore, become central for preserving a continuous and energetic interface among "cultures and sub-politics in a larger sphere of common citizenship" (Bohman, 1996: 145). The prominence of talk radio show is mainly inherent in its being conduits for citizens to "actively engage in public discourse, at times challenging elite discourse in the process" (Lee, 2007: 82). This suggests that talking to each other in public, "citizens shape their opinions and thus generate the collective will that then has some sort of impact" on each other (Dahlgren, 2002: 10). Pan and Kosicki (1997: 374) suggest that talk radio listening as an 'opinion activity'. The argument over democracy and participation rest, in large part, on the process by "which citizens form opinion" on the basis of diversity of public voices (Jacobs et al., 2009: 5). In a democratic society, public opinions are not "mere opinions" but rather

“supposed to be judgments about public matter rendered by citizens” (Lee, 2007: 80-81). Therefore, it is essential to study talk radio as a ‘democratic forum’ and talk radio listening as an ‘opinion activity’. Thus, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes might be imagined as the conduit to discussions of both parallel and oppositional to mainstream voices in the marketplace of ideas and project a highly credible voice to its audience, with immediate links to certain forms of political action.

The programmes also provide an alternative to mainstream discussions necessary to give marginalized groups arenas for public talk without the participation of the dominant groups (Squires, 2000; in Johnson, 2004: 358). Herbst (1995) contends that talk radio provides channels for the bottom up, unstructured communication of public opinions, as opposed to the top down, structured communication of public opinions in polling. Pan and Kosicki (1997: 374), submit that ‘exposure’ to radio talk shows, is “tantamount to participating in the collective process of constructing public discourse” leading to what Volter (2000) calls “opinion diversity”. To this end, the more attentive and engaged listeners are to the programmes the more likely they become more aware of diverse opinion on aspects of political problems through the processes of latent learning (Zaller, 1992: 333-37). Listening is a form of passive participation and listening to public debate one is likely to form an opinion about public affairs. Thus, participation in current affairs platform is assumed to deepen democracy by “cultivating the quality of public opinion and enhancing citizens’ civic-mindedness” (Farr, 1993: 379–91). Based upon these premises, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current listening can be analysed by examining the extent to which it “is related to citizens’ practices of and attitudes towards political debates and opinion expressions” (Lee, 2007: 79). Exposure to radio talk shows, is ‘tantamount to participating in the collective process of constructing public discourse’ (Pan and Kosicki,

1997: 374). Thus talk radio contribute to political communication by “stimulating public discourse and formulating public issues” (Crittenden, 1971: 200-210).

However, critics argue that talk radio elevates irrationality; turn ordinary people into performers in freak shows; and imply that politics is only personal (Curran, 2002: 238). For example, Tetley (2011: 30) contends that talk radio has suffered the humiliation of being invaded by some individuals who prefer to trade personal insults rather than take advantage of its democratic potential as a forum for deliberative political debate by informed citizens. Hofstetter et al. (1994: 468) contend that talk radio has been glamorized in popular media as a harbinger of populism run rampant, providing opportunities for cynical, malevolent manipulators of public opinion to mobilize the masses and undermine the bases of legitimacy of society, attack reasoned institutions with an electronic form of know-nothings, provide electoral success for venal, banal, cynical manipulators of opinion, and to bolster talk hosts' own ratings and salaries while keeping the cauldron of opinion boiling. In spite of the merits of these criticisms, talk radio do provide crucial forum for citizens to participate on significant issues of general concern in a fledgling democratic societies. In this situation, talk radio plays a noteworthy role in engendering political discussion by providing mediated public forums in which citizens are more empowered and thus more active in political discussions (Lee, 2007). In addition, talk radio is often thought of in relation to its democratic functions in keeping listeners up to date with socio-economic and political issues and provide a forum where these issues can be discussed by ordinary citizens (Crittenden, 1971; Hofstetter et al., 1994). The rise of talk radio in the United States of America in the early 1990s represents “citizens’ attempt to reassert both a public interest and public participation in the sphere of national politics” (Carey, 1993: 19). During the 1990s, researchers attempted to re-

examine the characteristics of talk radio listeners. Results showed that, contrary to the earlier understanding, “political talk radio listeners have higher levels of political interests and internal efficacy. They also pay more attention to the news media and are more likely to participate in politics. On the whole, talk radio listeners are found to be active participants in public life, while listening to talk radio may reinforce their propensity to participate” (Lee, 2007: 80).

The high profile of talk radio shows has prompted serious debates about their impact on and roles in political processes. Talk radio is likely to stimulate attention among audiences and engages listeners (Hofstetter, 1998: 283-85). Notably, a few studies of radio broadcasting in transitional societies have revealed the important role played by talk radio format and or genre in the democratization process. The medium of talk radio and citizen participation in the African continent has also attracted scholarly consideration. In South Africa, national talk radio like *SAFM* has played a significant role in getting citizens from different social-economic, racial and political ideological orientation talking together about matter of general concern, e.g., inequality, poverty, and unemployment are co-dependent socio-economic phenomena branded the 'triple challenge' in South Africa. Bosch (2011a: 80-85) notes that talk radio contributes to a discursive or deliberative democracy in which citizen participation and deliberation is considered more important than voting. It has great potential to play a strong role in promoting democracy and development through the creation of a democratic mediated public sphere. In this case, talk radio becomes and institutional arena of discursive public interaction. Likewise, Bosch (2011b: 207) notes that talk radio has a potential of democratising aspect in its ability to privilege certain forms of talk and play an agenda-setting role. Most remarkably, it provides the opportunity and space for important forms of political speech to flourish. In his work, *Audience*

Empowerment and the Politics of Representation in Two Radio Talk Shows in Post-Apartheid South Africa, Hungbo (2013) has shown that there are different ways by which audience can be marginalised on talk show discussions related to political issues in spite of the claim to empowerment of listeners. He further reiterates that more critical approach to radio broadcast talk shows is necessary in order to better understand their role in the envisaged more democratic South Africa where broader participation through media platforms may engender a robust public domain.

Although scholarship on radio broadcast talk shows within South African context has dealt with the democratic potential of the medium, to a large extent, they have neglected indigenous language broadcast media and its place in strengthening the democratic process of society, citizen participation and democratic sustenance, with its focus on mainstream English public and commercial broadcasting institution (Bosch, 2011 and Hungbo, 2013). In spite of this shortcoming, as Tetey (2011: 33) contends, in Ghana talk radio is indisputably a “repository of vibrant political discourse, providing platform for citizens to critically engage with key political issues, articulate diverse perspectives and mobilise support for different viewpoints and actions”. This view suggests that radio in Africa finds new ways of being seen not only as a medium of entertainment but also as a medium of talk in which citizens are able to shape public dialogue in democratic context. Furthermore, Odhiambo (2011:47), notes that talk radio in Kenya has played a vital role in “confronting the country’s previous culture of silence and in the process has nurtured a democratic culture by providing dialogic space” pertaining to salient matters of public interest. In Uganda, Mwesige (2009: 241) notes that participatory broadcasting has not only “facilitated dialogic space for political discussion, it has also widened spectrum of debate by opening it up to citizens”. In addition, Chibita’s (2011:283) study in Uganda

discovered the flexibility of radio to “permit the cultivation of an environment where all citizens feel free to express themselves in languages that make sense to them, but also where they are able to participate in debates that address broader issues beyond ethnic or national environments”.

The extent to which talk radio provides ordinary citizens with the opportunity to contribute in democratic participation is vital for democracy as citizen participation is one of the main issues in democratic project. The purpose of democratic talk on both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs arguably creates citizens who can think as a public, make reasoned political judgements, and imagine a common future for the common good (Barber 1984: 197). It thus offers one of the limited media environments in which ordinary citizens are given the opportunity to speak on issues affecting their own every day. The ideal democratic radio broadcaster is one that resolves its action through free and equal exchange of views as it invites and encourages arguments for all sides, and permits argument, rather than to coercion, the power to shape collective choices (Goffman, 1981: 70-71). The concern with talk radio (show) and democratic participation, however, is that the processes involved tend to be biased toward those with extensive civic skills, including a good vocabulary, the ability to articulate one’s thought, a sense of personal efficacy and the cognitive wherewithal to draw on hitherto existing political knowledge (Brundidge and Rice, 2009: 147). The most educated members of society disproportionately tend to have these skills. Education thus has a dominant role in shaping political activity because “it fosters psychological and cognitive engagement with politics (Verba et al., 1995: 433). This view suggests that “citizens with high political efficacy will have psychological involvement and more active in political participation” (Cohen, Vigoda, and Samorly, 2001: 734).

2.3.1 The Use of Indigenous Language in Radio Broadcasting

Motsweding FM is a public service broadcaster that broadcast using the indigenous language of Setswana. Chibita and Salawu (2016: 1) contend that language, plays a crucial role in the media as a “key public domain, to the extent that the languages people use in the media determine their chances of getting heard”. Radio broadcasting is a societal integrative force which offers the opportunity of “shared experience, contributing to authenticity by connecting the society to its cultural centre and acquainting the segments of society with each other” (Blumler, 1992: 11). It can be argued that it is through such a dynamic component that the public broadcasting of which *Motsweding* FM represent can serve as a meaningful cultural forum and a factor in South African democratic project (Newcomb and Hirsch 1983: 45-55). Radio, in particular, Public Service Broadcasting, has a distinctive role to play in holding power holders to account, to the extent to which the marginalized publics are given the platform to express their voice in their mother tongue. Accountability is primarily understood in terms of “giving an account” of something in language understood by the citizens. That is, publicly articulating, explaining, and most importantly justifying public policy in one’s indigenous language (Delli Carpini et al., 2004: 317).

The indispensable moral obligation of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes should therefore, be that “they represent all significant interests in society. They should facilitate their participation in the public domain, enable them to contribute to public debate and have input in framing of public policy, thereby assisting the equitable negotiation or arbitration of competing interests” through democratic discussion (Curran, 1991: 30). In terms of the *Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999*, among others, the public broadcaster should deliver full-spectrum services to all South Africans

in all parts of the country and in each of the eleven official languages. In pursuit of the public service mandate, the *Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999*, calls on *Motsweding FM* to serve the public as citizens who are capable and able to influence of social, political and economic issues by democratically participating in “public debate concerning matters affecting their life” (Enli, 2008:107). *Motsweding FM*’s *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes should therefore define themselves as a significant aspect in democratic participation and act accordingly. *Motsweding FM*’s as a PSB thus underpins democratic system by “supporting a national public culture of shared knowledge, values and points of reference” (Dahlgren, 2000a). In the context of citizens’ democratic participation, public broadcasting can be distinguished into ‘participation in the media’ and ‘participation through the media’ (Carpentier, 2011). Participation in the media deals with the participation of non-professionals in the production of media output (content-related participation such as audience input) and participation in media decision-making (structural participation such as editorial process). It allows citizens to be active in one of the many (micro-) spheres relevant to daily life and to put their right to communicate into practice (Carpentier, 2009: 409).

The right to communicate thus enters the realm of enabling and facilitating macro-participation, while participation, ‘through’ the media deals with the opportunities for widespread participation in public debate and for self-representation in the public spheres (Couldry, 2003). Self-representation in the mediated indigenous public spheres not only mandates acknowledgement of ethnic identity in the new nation building, but it also gives an opportunity of lesson learning on the potentiality of using local public broadcaster as one of the tools for citizen empowerment (Dahal, and Aram, 2013:1). As a consequence, language as a tool of participation and empowerment becomes crucial in bringing

together different segments of marginalised society who often lacks efficacy to express themselves with English which is mostly associated with intelligence. In effect, Teer-Tomaselli and Tomaselli, (1994:60) contend that “the language policies adopted by the SABC are setting national examples for language policies in other areas”. Thus, language, from the perspective of inclusive democratic participation, offers a context within which members of marginalised groups could build confidence and capabilities and their culturally specific modes of communication could find expression. However, Salawu (2016:18) remarkably notes that the indigenous language media, radio broadcasting included “could also be used as counter democratic movement and agitation”. The indigenous language (media) radio broadcasting stations have also been criticised for constructing and disseminating narratives of hate, using embellished metaphors and the ethicised stereotypical of humour. These as Salawu (2004: 259) observes can lead and modify the opinions of their peoples forming stereotypes for them about other ethnic groups; thereby fuelling further the social conflicts”.

Notwithstanding these challenges, the indigenous language radio broadcasting still remains a crucial avenue for enlightening citizens for positive developmental goals that includes democracy. The accessibility of radio in languages other than the colonial ones enables audiences to express themselves on issues of socio-economic and political issues (Chibita, 2011:272). Teer-Tomaselli and Tomaselli (1994:51) concur as she states that “if PSB is to continue to play a part national reconstruction, it must do so largely in the context of its contribution to the local, regional and specific language requirements of the country”. Language serves not only the instrumental functions recognised in standard liberal democracy but also serves to maintain individual autonomy, express self-identity, and reformulate interests (Barber 1984: 3). The use of indigenous language in

broadcasting has the capacity to foster participation in the democratic process. It can encourage citizens to have opinions and be able to express them in their local languages about public affairs. Thus, language itself provides “us with a way of structuring our experience of ourselves and the world” (Burr, 1995: 33). The debates on indigenous language broadcast media implies that citizens’ interest and aspirations are best served when communicated with the language of origin. For example, Akpojivi and Fosu, (2016: 146) and Karikari (1993) argues that indigenous language broadcast media strengthen democratic processes. This is because citizens have the ability to understand the language used to the extent that they are able to contribute in mediated public discussion. In similar vein, it could be argued that indigenous language radio broadcasting and or indigenous language mass media “continues to play a key role in Africa’s democratisation process” (Salawu, 2016: 24). For instance, in South Africa with reference to newspapers, Buthelezi (2016: 85) contends that *Ilanga Newspaper* is a “dialogic space among citizens’ issues of origin, identity, history and social development”. Thus, it makes a major contribution to democratic discourse.

In his work, “*The Return of the Local: Community Radio as Dialogic and Participatory*”, Brilliant Mhlanga (2016:107) notes that “community radio bears the picture and emblem of the community and becomes the community’s source of identity, with their hopes and aspirations captured through local language broadcasts”. Indigenous-language radio broadcasting is a fundamental component of a “broader diversity that relates to enhanced public presence and political participation for all citizens” (Chibita, 2011:276). Public service broadcasting, of which *Motsweding FM* represents, has the potential to enable the majority of rural populations to participate democratically in public debates on important issues affecting their everyday lives, particularly in the language they feel

comfortable with (Chibita, 2011:270). *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs programme serves as a significant mechanism to encourage political participation through dialogue across the airwaves with a language understood by a substantial portion of the population (Johnson, 2004: 355). The language of radio, as Chibita (2011:272) argues, “must make both intellectual and emotional sense for ordinary citizens to optimize radio for political participation”. In 1994, South Africa attained formal democracy and embarked on a road of constitutional democracy to surpass the exclusion and divisions produced by the apartheid government. The era widened prospects in the South African broadcast media landscape to encourage citizens’ participation in the democratic processes, and thereby “created and invoked new meanings of citizenship” (Malila, Oelofsen, Garman and Wasserman, 2013: 416). This period arguably placed constitutional obligation on the South African Broadcasting Corporation, especially SABC radio stations broadcasting in indigenous languages, to empower previously marginalized citizens who found themselves excluded from the mainstream public and commercial talk radio stations on the basis of socio-economic and cultural (linguistic) factors.

Chibita’s (2011: 282-83) study also demonstrates the fundamental and significant role of “indigenous-language radio” in its contribution to citizen participation in terms of cultural expression and preservation. In other words, the indigenous-language radio safeguards the interest of marginalised citizens, by providing forums for public express and representation. Thus, the *Broadcasting Act No: 4 of 1999* entrusts *Motsweding FM* with cultivating an atmosphere where all “citizens feel free to express themselves in languages that make sense to them, but also where they are able to participate in debates that address broader issues beyond ethnic or national environments” (Chibita, 2011: 283). The public broadcaster should therefore, further and support rational deliberation in

indigenous languages so that a well-informed community is able to make the best personal decision possible and participate fully in their public life. Radio broadcasting may contribute to a strong participatory democracy in situation whereby citizens are provided platform to express themselves in their Indigenous language which is necessary to foster citizenship through educating each other in the affairs of the state. Consequently, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes can serve as an arena for politicized debate, produce new topics and issues for citizens and bring about a new type of interactions and relationships among journalists, politicians, and citizens in their indigenous languages (Gunther, Montero and Wert, 2000).

2.4 Radio Broadcasting, Democratic Participation and Citizenship

Considerable literature around citizen participation basically uses citizenship to mean “the act of any person taking part in public affairs” (Gaventa, 2002: 3). The field of sociology defines ‘citizenship’ as a “set of practices that make people competent members of a community” (Turner, 1994: 159). Rather, a citizen is an individual regarded as an “equal member of the community, accorded the respect and full rights of all other citizens, who actively assumes responsibility for his or her participation” (Higgins, 1999: 293). Murdock (1999: 8) describes the fundamental prerogative of citizenship as “the right to participate fully in social life with dignity and without fear and to help formulate the forms it might take in the future”. Hart (2009: 643) contends that citizenship “enables citizen participation and enables them to express what they think their contributions could be”. Extending the notion of citizenship also implies that the right to participation itself should be seen as a basic citizenship right which helps to protect and guarantee all others. As Lister (1998) suggests, “the right of participation in decision making in social, economic, cultural and political life should be included in the nexus of basic human rights”. The concept of

citizenship therefore appears to be an evolving idea in theory and in practice. In this circumstance, it takes the form of participation in public discussion and aiming to influence decision-making process in an institutional context that equalizes the ability of marginalised groups to speak and be heard (Young, 1990:189). The notion of 'citizenship', therefore, infers parity of status and respect as a member of society and being bestowed the same rights as every other citizen (Moon, 1988; Walzer, 1983). In addition, citizenship is "social rights which nurture one's sense of personal empowerment and respect, as well as one's responsibility to collectively engage in the life of the community" (Higgins, 1999:304). Citizenship empowers every citizen to feel like a "full member of society by being able to participate in and appreciate public life" (Higgins, 1999: 290). Thus, it is imperative that citizens should reason together and persuade "one another about values or course of action" (Fung, 2004: 17).

The agency of citizenship has been the subject of a public debate regarding democracy. Citizenship as participation on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs can be seen as signifying an expression of human agency in the political arena. Traditionally public service broadcasters have been uncertain towards including the public as participants in programming contexts as its duty to promote active citizenship. However, radio broadcasting can notably play a significant part in expressing of human agency by organising a new system of citizenship representation which aims at extending citizenship rights (Murdock, 1992: 33). The public broadcaster can contribute to the practice of citizenship that goes beyond the legal status of having the right to reside, work and vote in a country. These rights entail the ability to speak out, and be listened to in the public sphere. In a mass-mediated society, citizenship presumes both access to information and the capacity to understand it and have the right to become agents in the

processes of communication (Milton, Wasserman and Garman, 2013: 407-408). Thus, citizenship refers to the process that leads to “the articulation of certain rights, the forging of a societal consensus about the nature and extent of rights and obligations, about the balance between different often conflicting rights (Cammaerts and Carpentier, 2007: 2). Specifically, citizenship addresses itself to “cultural citizenship” (Dahlgren, 2000: 317) which infer “the right to know and speak” (Hartley, 2010: 238). *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes enable citizens to “envision and articulate a common future in terms of genuinely common goods by transforming strangers into citizen-neighbours” through collective socio-economic and political discussions (Barber, 1984:197). Thus, Jones (1994) argues that citizenship definitions require to be developed beyond formal participation in voting to include actions practiced by citizens of specific identities in particular locations. In line with the transformation of South African democratic project, it therefore, vital for radio broadcasting to create forums for citizens to participate in public debate that affect their well-being.

Cultural citizenship on *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs manifests itself in the context whereby citizen’s experiences and views, whatever their background, culture or social location are recognised and respected (Hart, 2009: 645). Hartley (2010: 238) explains that ‘cultural citizenship’ encompasses citizenship from citizen participation to “social entitlements and exposes the concept to challenge by its traditional opposite– the consumer”. In this sense, democratic participation means “inclusiveness” of citizens as audience, and guarantees that every audience has the opportunity to participate on matters of common or public concern (Wilhelm, 1998: 316). Inclusivity relates to the voice that “all citizens have an equal right to be heard to introduce and question claims and to express and challenge needs, values and interests” (Smith and Wales, 2000: 53). Thus,

the principle of “inclusivity” establishes a positive expectation that the voices of diverse citizenry through *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes would, in practice, be heard (Jacobs et al., 2009: 11). Hungbo, (2013: 226) explains that the expression of inclusion originates from the thought of participation, having to do with the expansion of democratic order. *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs public deliberation assumes an essential role in terms of enabling “citizens to organise themselves into publics capable of understanding, responding to, and directing their state” (Fung, 2002: 66).

The arguments on participation in institutionalized politics, including media participation, have similarities in that “they all focus on the distribution of power within society at both the macro- and micro-levels. The balance between citizens’ inclusion in the implicit and explicit decision-making processes within these fields and their exclusion through the delegation of power (again, implicit or explicit) is central to all discussions on participation” (Carpentier, 2014: 1002). In other words, writes McEwan (2005: 972), “individuals have agency in the construction and contestation of their citizenship, rather than being passive recipients of a pre-determined” information provided by the media. In contrast, when “an individual citizen is unable to participate in public debate, and unable to contribute in influencing decision-making process that may affects his or her life, self-esteem” may be hindered (Younis, 1995: 265). This may have an implication for a lack of full active citizenship within the socio-political system in which accountability is delegated to those in positions of power. The inclusion of citizen participation on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs is consistent with the idea of empowerment. The inclusion of the political component for empowerment is “viewed within the political arena that debates issues affecting the basic values of the society” (Anderson, Wilson, Mwansa and

Osei-Hwedie, 1994: 82). The concepts of participation and empowerment underpin participatory democracy (Beresford and Trevillion, 1995). Mutz (2006:51) argues that participatory democracy is a meaningful opportunity for the citizens to participate in the political process through debate. Citizenship further embraces aspects of empowerment and vice versa and participation is integral to both concepts. Citizenship and empowerment include the ideas of belonging and the rights essential for participation in social and political environments (Higgins, 1999: 292-293). Citizenship in a deliberative democracy, consequently, means participating in "the determination of norms of action through the practical debate of all affected by them" (Benhabib, 1992: 86).

Through participating on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs, one can achieve citizenship, a sense of control over one's life and a heightened sense of belonging and membership- in essence, a sense of empowerment (Higgins, 1999: 293). Accordingly, if democratic citizenship is ultimately about "the collective and participatory engagement of citizens in the determination of the affairs of their community" (Dietz, 1987: 14), then marginalized dissident citizens who address the wider polity in order to change minds, challenge practices, or even reconstitute the very boundaries of the political sphere itself may engage in a form of democratic citizenship that is essential for the continuing revitalization of democratic life (Sparks, 1997:75). Therefore, citizenship in a participatory democracy requires significant participation in institutions "designed to facilitate ongoing civic participation in agenda-setting and deliberation (Barber, 1984:151). Thus, the debate over radio broadcasting institution as a public sphere and democratic participation take the notions of citizenship into cognizant. The public sphere is a central– although contested– notion in this regard" (Cammaerts and Carpentier, 2007: 2). In South Africa, with its 'bifurcated public sphere' (Heller, 2009), the public broadcaster

can contribute to citizenship that goes beyond the legal status of having the right to reside, work and vote in a country, to the practice of cultural citizenship where citizens irrespective of the country of origin, participate in public debate. To fulfil this democratic promise, *Motsweding* FM does not only need to empower citizens on the legal status. It also needs to provide a communicative setting that fosters inclusive public participation beyond nationalities to eradicate ignorance, ethnocentrism and xenophobia that persist to divide and give Africa and Africans a bad name in pursuit of promoting social cohesion and “listening across difference” (Dreher, 2009).

Consequently, Young (1990: 191) argues in a “society differentiated by social groups, occupations, political positions, differences of privileges and oppression and regions, the perception of anything like a common good can only be an outcome of public interaction that expresses rather than submerges particularities”. The fundamental view in the argument is that democracies need informed and participant citizens to manage their common affairs. It also believes that public debate is more likely to produce rational and just outcomes if it takes into account different views and interests (Curran, 2002: 205). Thus, it could be argued that in order for these rights to be realised, the public broadcaster’s role is to provide a forum encouraging pluralistic debate about public affairs and a mobilising citizens’ participation in the political process. The *Broadcasting Act No: 4 of 1999*, therefore, entrusts *Motsweding* FM as a public broadcaster to offer programming intended to deepen citizenship through participation with the ultimate purpose of empowering them. An empowered citizenry is considered to be a benchmark for full citizenship on the basis of its centrality to a democratic system of government, because in democracy, those who govern should at all times be held accountable to the governed. Besides, democracy is based on active participation by citizens in the social

and political life of society (Gurevitch, Levy and Roeh, 1991: 195). This is true if democracy means government by discussion among equal citizens or what Schudson (1997: 297-309) terms “government by rational and free public discussion” conversation must lie close to its core. This view echoes citizen participation as a valuable component of democratic citizenship and decision-making process through news and current affairs programmes discussion segment which provide avenue through which citizens demonstrate a greater predisposition to engage in politically concerned activities (Michels and De Graaf, 2010: 477-478; Huckfeldt and Sprague, 1995).

2.4.1 Political Efficacy and Citizenship Participation on *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele*

Held (2006: 215) notes, participatory democracy is committed to making citizens informed, thus showing great certainty in their ability to self-governance. The exercise of effective citizenship, as participatory democrats argue, entails a participatory society which “promotes political efficacy, inspires concern for collective problems, and encourages the formation of an informed community of citizens capable of self-government” (Held, 1987: 262). Considering this perspective, one can argue that citizens (audience) participation in broadcast news and current affair platform is positively associated with political efficacy. This study describes ‘political efficacy’ as the citizens’/audience belief that their views have the power to influence the socio-economic and political environment (Zimmerman, 1989: 554). In this view, the opportunity provided by *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes for citizens to participate nurtures one’s political efficacy by allowing the ordinary person to contribute meaningfully in their democratic process (Muthukumaraswamy 2010: 48). Therefore, political efficacy can be described as a sense of audience empowerment where the

callers feel their opinion can influence the political process (Pinkleton, Austin and Portman, 1998). The idea of political efficacy derives from Bandura's (1977) notion of self-efficacy (the cognitive domain) which refers to the judgments one makes concerning how well one can perform the behaviour necessary to achieve desired goals (Rappaport and Seidman, 2000). The concept of self-efficacy is about audience's subjective faith in his/her own ability to influence mediated public discourse and to make a difference in public life (Zittel, 2007: 12). Consequently, Bello and Wilkinson (2017: 23) contend that "political efficacy and participation" are important behaviours for a healthy democracy.

This study understands political efficacy in the context of citizens as audience acquiring political knowledge in the mediated discussions (Semetko and Valkenburg, 1998). This mediated discussion may in turn empower citizens as audience's political knowledge, and individual's concern in political issues, which are significant precursors of civic and democratic participation (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993). In political science, "political efficacy" includes two dimensions, that is, internal efficacy, which denotes "the belief that citizens can affect government policy making, and external efficacy, which denotes the beliefs about the political system's approachability to the will and actions of citizens" (Berry, Portney and Thomson, 1993). Scholars generally accept the relationship between citizen's political efficacy and democratic participation. Morell (2005: 50) for example, contends that "without internal political efficacy, individuals will likely become apathetic about, indifferent to and disengaged" from the democratic discussions. Internal political efficacy may arguably develop when citizens are exposed to divergent viewpoints on both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes (Mutz and Martin, 2001: 97). Studies further submit that "efficacy, knowledge, and participation" are interconnected concepts and are central political variables and indicators of a healthy and

well-functioning democracy (McLeod, Scheufele, and Moy, 1999). Galston (2001) also indicates that democratic participation in broadcast participatory programmes has significant effect on audience attitudes that their views on public issues matter. Delli Carpini (2004:398) notes that citizens' democratic attitudes such as political efficacy are positively associated with the amount and quality of democratic participation. Thus, democratic 'attitudes and opinions' are shaped through political discussion, and personal reflection. Galston (2001) reiterates that "people possessing more political knowledge were better able to understand political processes and events, more likely to support core democratic principles such as tolerance, and more likely to participate in public matters". It also reveals an important relationship between participation on broadcast political talk show programmes and citizen's political efficacy. In a longitudinal study, Semetko and Valkenburg (1998) established a 'causal relationship' from news use to a subsequent political efficacy. Broadcast news discussion platform thus becomes a crucial area for the media to construct a conducive environment for the cultivation of citizen's political efficacy.

2.4.2 Radio broadcasting, Democratic Participation Effects and Civic Education

The media effects literature, has extensively demonstrated that public do learn from media, but also knowledge and interest determine which media the public is exposed to. An interested citizen, Doiste-Goulet (2009: 406), writes is "one who at least cares about some issues of public concern". Heath, Andersen and Sinnott (2002) recognize the "core components of citizens' political knowledge as civic knowledge and knowledge" of both national and international affairs. Dow (2009: 122) contends that "political knowledge has been associated with the knowledge level of citizens with whom one is having a politically centred conversation". Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996: 10–11), define political knowledge

as “the range of factual information about politics that is stored in long-term memory”. Eveland and Hutchens (2008) understand political knowledge as “knowledge of the political realm”. For this reason, political knowledge is a “functional and essential element” of a sustainable democracy (Memoli, 2011:79). Economic news, for example, can help citizens to decide whether to save or spend; consumer news helps determine the scale of citizens purchases; environmental news can change not just consumer behaviour but what they do at home as well (Soroka et al., 2012: 719). Public service broadcasters generally transmit programming that aims to improve society by informing citizenry to acquires political skills and develop qualities necessary for popular self-government and effective control over their environment (Herman and Chomsky, 1988: 66).

The mass media, by extension, the public broadcasting service, do have impact in informing and socialising citizens to participate in politics and setting the agenda for public debate and shaping perceptions concerning their political efficacy and the value of democratic participation (Davies, 1993). Because of their presumed influence, the mass media become “a site on which various social groups, institutions, and ideologies struggle over the definition and construction of social reality” (Gurevitch and Levy, 1985). The effects democratic participation through broadcast debate, as argued by participatory democrats is that participation has several functions in democracy. Amongst them is the educative function which infers that citizens may “increase their civic knowledge and become more competent if they participate” in public deliberations (Michels and De Graaf, 2010: 480). In this view, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs discussion segment provide a series of arenas in which symbolic contests are carried out among competing sponsors of meaning (Kellner, 1990). Thus, the effects of radio broadcast participatory programmes have educative function because they put citizens in

touch with whose ideas and values dissimilar from their own (Stouffer, 1955: 127). The public broadcaster's part as far as the effects of participation is concerned relate to civic education and shaping citizen's political activity. McAllister (1998) notes that education "produces higher levels of political knowledge that, in turn, makes a person a better democratic citizen". More broadly, citizenship education through radio broadcasting, encourages citizens to "acquire civic knowledge, civic skills and civic values. It is more likely to produce engaged citizens as well as to assist with the formation of social capital" (Print, 2007: 330). This is in line with several schools of contemporary democratic thought which hold that "participation has individual-level effects" (Finkel, 1985; 892).

The influence and effects of democratic participation through public broadcasting is a central idea of civic education. This study defines radio broadcast influence and effects on citizen's democratic participation as a means for citizens' democratic education and training (Delli Carpini et al., 2004: 315). This is because public broadcasting service has been recognised for promoting democracy in many parts of the world by encouraging citizens' democratic participation in matter of public concern. However, Bennett (1988) notes the main effects of mass media news in democratic politics as "setting limits on the imaginable and the politically possible; arriving too late to educate" citizens and get them involved in policy-decision making discussions. The centrality of radio broadcasting and democratic participation to civic education is in promoting equality and reducing the knowledge gap among citizens (Larsen, 2011: 39). The notion of education is therefore, central to democratic participation. In radio broadcasting terms it has to been understood as a means of citizen empowerment and be analysed in view of the model of participatory democracy. In this paradigm, access to the radio broadcast is viewed as a way to educate ordinary citizens to contribute in the public debate (Pateman, 1970; Brecht, 1974).

Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele news and current affairs act as a public platform for civic education through which the public can voice their opinions, and influence each other in a democratic decision making processes (Sabir, 2013: 223). Accordingly, the public service broadcaster is expected to provide information to the public and enable citizens to act as critical and independent subjects motivated by the ideal of equal access for everyone consistent with social and political democratic values. Radio broadcast public debate is capable of producing changes in citizens' democratic values, attitudes, and behaviours consistent with democratic citizenship. This is because democratic participation fosters citizens psychological and cognitive engagement with politics (Verba et al., 1995: 433). The cumulative effects of public broadcaster's responsibility in facilitating public discussion therefore, is to the extent to which citizen's cognitive faculty thought to be identical with political judgments on public issues develops (Barber, 1989: 355). Thus, Pateman (1970), argues, participation, apart from being a good thing in itself, it also plays a crucial educative role. Kaufman (1960) who is credited with being the one who first coined the term 'participatory democracy', argues that citizen participation is crucial because "it contributes to the development of human powers of thought, feeling and action".

The effects of participatory broadcast politics are in its contribution to the enlargement of "human powers of thought, feeling, and action" (Hilmer, 2010:45). Through radio broadcast participatory programmes, it can be argued that citizens are likely to "develop the skill and psychological qualities necessary for democratic participation, and the sense of efficacy that ensures continued participation" (Bickford, 1996: 12). J. S. Mill also argues that participation fulfils a protective function and, more particularly, an educative function that leads to the development of involved citizens. For Rousseau, participation yields

popular control of the body politic because participation includes each member in the equal sharing of benefits and burdens. Like Rousseau, Mill presumes that behaviour is shaped by political participation and, in turn, that sustains participation (Pateman, 1970). These views suggest that not only does participation lead to control, it also has an educative effect that reinforces and sustains participation which has the potential to lead to citizens' empowerment. Ideally, a public broadcaster suitable for a democracy ought to provide its citizens with some coherent sense of the broader social forces that affect the conditions of their everyday lives (Gamson et al., 1992: 373). The educative function of radio broadcast news and currents affairs is central to citizen's democratic participation because participation itself transforms audiences' character by strengthening his/her psychological and practical capacity for political participation (Wolfe, 1985: 370-389). Pateman (1970: 42-45) argues that the experience of participation in public broadcasting debate contributes in an individual's psychological empowerment and undertaking of further participation in the future. That suggests that when citizens vigorously participate in democratic debate— debate and deliberate public affairs—they are more likely to cultivate the necessary attitudes, skills and psychological qualities that contribute to individual political efficacy, and which in turn will increase political participation. Accordingly, the act of participation in broadcast debates is itself educative as it cultivates and fosters the very qualities necessary for it.

The central role of the public service broadcasting is to help citizens articulate their shared interests in its contribution to the shared notion of the public interest (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2003: 549). Therefore, radio broadcasting can play an influential role in re-socialization and transformation by educating citizens with new way of participating in politics and socio-economic life by heartening their citizens' democratic participation. The

mode and intensity of participation is likely to mediate the educative impact of participation by empowering citizens as well providing “confidence and sense of mastery” desirable to become active citizens (Carter, 2007: 179). The more individuals participate in the public affairs that affect their lives, the better able to do so in future. Thus, opposing point of views resulting from radio broadcast citizens’ participation is likely to improve the information base upon which individual decisions are made. In addition to educating citizens, broadcast discussion can also be the instrument for constructing a feeling of efficacy and trust in political institutions and in fellow citizens. In its many forms, education, “will thus always retain its relevance for democracy and citizenship” (Dahlgren, 2009: 109). Citizens democratic participation in radio broadcast news and current affairs public debate where opposing arguments are granted a respectful bearing and countered by persuasion, or accepted on their merits, is educational as “it cultivates the virtues of eloquence, clarity of thought and expression, and sound judgment” (Lasch, 1990: 8). Broadcast participation, in addition, is anticipated to cultivate better decisions, and thus more competencies to society as a whole (Thomas, 1995).

A second function of participatory democracy in radio broadcasting is the integrative function. Nelson and Wright (1995) view the participatory process as a “transformative tool for social change”. Citizens participation in public debate may contributes to citizens’ feeling of being public citizens and part of their community. Warren (1992: 12), for instance writes that participation, “completes individuals, in part by enabling them to discover and develop their public dimensions, in part by providing the kinds of interactions that develop capacities for autonomous judgment”. Autonomous citizens are the one who can “make decisions based on critical examination of their needs and interests and have the capacity to participate in the process that resolve conflicts between needs and

interests by means of public discourse” (Warren, 1993: 214). In other words, as Warren (1993: 216) states, “autonomy implies communicative competencies” that can exist only with social fabric created by speaking. The debates in favour of maximising audience participation commonly concentrate on the benefits of the process itself. As a consequence, they may also feel more responsible personally for public decisions (Michels and De Graaf, 2010: 480). This is because citizens have shared vision, values and shared social economy in which the welfare of the citizens and “the community is paramount and the transformative process is both socially and politically participatory and culturally vibrant” (Mogekwu, 2002). Kim et al., (1999: 361) also recognise that participation in broadcasting debate underpins a sense of political ability and generates prospects for effective solution of problems, and heartens public commitment. Pateman (1970) explains that as “one participates in politics, s/he acquires political skills and perceptions of self-competence, which are qualities necessary for popular self-government and effective control over one’s environment”. In this process, the citizen understands the social, economic, political and cultural oppression they face and strengthen their “power within” (Parpart, Rai and Staudt, 2003). The power within develops citizen’s necessary knowledge and fosters confidence in the possibility of change.

The citizens’ feeling of “increased power and the capacity to influence the forces which affect one’s life space for one’s own benefit can be characterised” as empowerment (Pinderhughes, 1983: 332). In addition, public service broadcasters (PSBs) are a central part on provision of both domestic and international, is essential for fostering an informed and engaged citizenry. Citizens depend on news about the world around them in order to participate in democratic governance, but also to make basic choices about how to live

from one day to the next (Soroka et al., 2012: 719). In other words, informed and empowered citizenry who are capable of engaging in dialogue about matters of national and international affairs likely to impact on their lives, are central features of society's democratic project. Moreover, public service broadcasting has been attributed a crucial role in modern-day democracy as important mediators of the 'public' (Coleman and Ross, 2010: 3). It plays an increasingly crucial role in contemporary democracies since "they are the main source of information for the vast majority" of the citizens (Vreese and Semetko, 2004: 14). This entitlement to information is best secured through "public service broadcasting because it gives due attention to public affairs and is less dominated than market-based systems by entertainment (Curran, 2002: 205).

The idea that access to news strengthens the democratic process has been a dominant resistance for public service broadcasting. Commercial broadcasting need audiences and advertisers to survive; market incentives lead to the overproduction of content that is popular, and a lack of supply of the kind of information that meets public affairs requirements. Commercial broadcasters may also beholden to advertisers, and/or may show partisan biases. While the market can generate dedicated news or information channels, these tend to attract elite audiences and to reinforce the knowledge gap between elites and the general public (Soroka et al., 2012: 719; Curran, 2002: 205). Contrary to commercial broadcasting, public service broadcasting raises general levels of political awareness by including news and current affairs programmes in prime time on popular and generalist channels. One system takes into account the informational needs of democracy while the other does not and tends to be disempowering large sections of the citizens through lack of information (Curran, 2002: 205). Lack of information contributes to knowledge deficit, which leads to powerlessness. Political information

which is the basis for political knowledge and the subsequent desire and means to participate in political debate are highly contingent upon the mass media. Savigny (2013:13) writes that “the knowledge we have is ultimately dependent on the information we access and receive” to certain degree through the mass media. The quality of democracy, therefore, rests on information generating institutions like public service broadcasting to act as a tool for empowerment. Public broadcaster is an important source for political information and contribute to democratic project (Dewey, 1954; Dahl, 1989).

Access to information is essential to the health of democracy for at least two reasons. “First, it ensures that citizens make responsible, informed choices rather than acting out of ignorance or misinformation. Second, information serves a checking function by ensuring that elected representatives uphold their oaths of office and carry out the wishes of those who elected them” (US-AID, 1999: 5). Access to information, consequently implies a form of empowerment (Hameso, 1995). Public service broadcasting of which *Motsweding FM* represents can therefore, develop citizens’ political knowledge, widens their horizons, and enables individual citizens as audience to understand themselves by “better understanding the world and others” (Banerjee and Seneviratne, 2006: 2). Thus, Lasch (1990: 1) argues that information, commonly assumed as “the precondition of debate, is better understood as its by-product”. The public broadcaster can be effective in establishing the conditions favourable for citizens learning politics. PSB serves as a public institution that educates, informs, entertains the public and shapes “public consciousness” by providing information to the public and enabling citizens to act as critical and independent subjects (Sabir, 2013: 223). Thus, access to meaningful political information aiming to empowered citizen becomes an essential component of participatory democracy (Dahl, 1998).

2.4.3 Radio News, Exposure and Democratic Participation

The correlation between mass media and democratic participation is generally defined with attention to the study of news media and wealth of literature provides evidence that exposure to news media as early stated is certainly related with both manifest in latent forms of participation (Eveland and Scheufele, 2000; de Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2006). In a cross-sectional study on news exposure and democratic participation, Jung, Kim and de Zuniga (2011: 407-430), found that “exposure had a significant association with political participation through its impact on political discussion, political knowledge and efficacy”. Pan and Kosicki (1997: 373) maintain that “exposure to talk shows (political discussion) means not only watching or listening to newscasts to take in information, but also being exposed to the aspects that include audiences arguing, reasoning, and discussing”. They further reiterate that “exposure to and participation in television and radio talk shows (political discussion) is tantamount to participating in the collective process of constructing public discourse on the issues that are believed to be common concerns of at least some members of the mass public” (Pan and Kosicki, 1997: 374).

In addition, Lee and Capella’s (2001) study established that, “although both pre-existing political knowledge and exposure to political talk were important in attitude formation, the exposure element had more predictive accuracy”. Exposure to radio news is thus crucial for information provision because it is the basis for knowledge, and the latter is power. It is because of this rationale that the public broadcaster, first and foremost, in its “information function” has been hailed as the “lifeblood of democracies, pivotal for the functioning of healthy and vibrant democratic systems” (Gurevich et al., 1991: 195). A study of the interrelationship between mass media exposure and both political knowledge and campaign interest showed that they are causally related. As Atkin, Galloway and

Nayman, (1976) claimed, “mass media exposure is functionally related to political knowledge and political interest, and both factors are attributable to mass media usage patterns”. For example, an apparent relationship between exposures to mass communication, especially television, and increased political interest has been noted in some Western countries, such as the United States, England, and Germany (Blumler and McQuail, 1968; Noelle-Neumann, 1981). Ross (2004: 785) discovered that “interest in mediated politics is often prompted by an interest in media effects in exploring how listeners, viewers and readers are influenced (or not) by party political discourse to change their attitudes and behaviours”. Studies also have established that listeners who pay more attention to the news media are more likely to participate in politics (Barker, 1998; Pan and Kosicki, 1997). In this way, an interest to participate in democratic political debate is likely to develop. Noelle-Neumann (1993) also strongly associates “news media use and talking politics”. Her study found that news media use and political talk “have positive effects on certain measures of the character of argumentation and consideration of alternative viewpoints” (ibid).

Scholars holding the influential view of political deliberation reveal that those citizens who are encouraged to talk politics primarily by political desires, gain political information, have the efficacy to express their issue positions, and to persuade others (Kim and Kim, 2008). In his study of citizen participation, Katz (1992) found that news media use, both in general and issue-specific, is closely linked with the frequency of political conversation in daily life. News media thus facilitate democratic participation by enhancing individuals’ levels of knowledge in politics, and perceived competence to understand and deal with politics (Jung, Kim, and Gil de Zúñiga, 2011: 410). Several studies in political science confirmed positive relationship between levels of political knowledge and democratic

participation (Sotirovic and McLeod, 2001; Verba et al., 1995). These studies indicate that political knowledge matters because “it enables citizens to discern their individual and group interests, connect their interests to broader notions of the public good, and express their views through political participation” (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996: 1). This research trajectory views the news media as a major contribution to political process by providing “public affairs information and promoting a culture of democracy” (Curran: 2002: 7).

Scholars further suggest that “political knowledge is grounded on developing events and people in the political sphere” (Garrazone and Atkin, 1986). In the absence of certain knowledge, politics has a “predominantly epistemological function, and talk is the means by which people come to know both themselves and the world around them” (Stein, 1998:24). *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes can be a tool to capacitate audience as citizens by fostering their political knowledge to participation in the democratic discourse (McIntosh, Hart and Younis, 2007). Politically, the notion that citizens need to be adequately informed with a full and intelligent coverage of public affairs during election’s time so that they can make responsible, informed choices rather than act out of ignorance and misinformation, is one of the ways public broadcaster can help citizens to decide on who governs based on citizens’ political knowledge of current affairs. Radio broadcast news is not exception, among other forms of the news media. Radio broadcast news use may also encourage citizen’s perception to be acquainted to political affairs, which inspires efficacious feeling about politics (Hoffman and Thompson, 2009; Kenski and Stroud, 2006). *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes play a significant role in providing the citizenry with information about politics (Chaffee and Frank, 1996). For example, Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996: 218–67) have

demonstrated that for the United States, “political knowledge is positively associated with attitudes and behaviour conducive to democratic politics, such as holding coherent opinions and political tolerance”. Contrary to these findings, Kaid, McKinney and Tedesco’s (2007) study reveal that citizens “largely attributed their lack of political participation to a lack of political knowledge”. PSB is understood as an institution that develops knowledge, broadens horizons and enables citizens to better understand themselves by better understanding the world and others through open public debate.

In terms of the *Broadcasting Act No: 4 of 1999*, the public broadcaster, in this context, *Motsweding FM*’s news and current affairs should provide citizens with adequate information in order take part in democratic processes. These programmes can be a source of insight, reflection and political knowledge. Thus, exposure to and participation on *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs discussion segment is identical to participating in the collective process of creating public dialogue on the issues that are thought to be of common concerns. *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs’ discussion segment becomes a forum for citizens to express their opinions and to engage in discussions with those who hold different opinions or to discover those who share the same opinions. The programmes allow citizens to communicate to those who “operate in the realm of public sentiment or public opinions, although the realm may be constructed, and they energise certain concrete political actions” (Pan and Kosicki, 1997: 374). In addition, Kotze (1986), in a study of more than 1000 students in South Africa, aimed at elucidating the linkage between political behaviour and the mass media, found that “the intense interest of the black groups (such as Africans) in politics is related to their tendency to read the political contents of newspapers and to a high preference for politically oriented television programs. However, nearly twice as many were interested

in the political coverage of the press than in watching televised politically related programs”. This line of reasoning implies that media content has the ability to increase political knowledge, which in turn maximise the levels of political participation (Gurevitch and Blumler, 1990; Moy, Xenos, and Hess, 2005: 114). Studies have also established that debate about public affairs is an important indicator of political participation— political talk, television and print media use, and issue-specific media use have positively predicted democratic participation (Huckfeldt and Sprague: 1995).

2.4.4 Summary

This chapter aimed to locate the study of *Motsweding* FM as a public broadcaster and its reason for existence (mandate) funding model, governance model and challenges facing the public broadcasting institution. within the context of existing knowledge in public radio broadcasting and democratic participation. It drew on various arguments and different school of thoughts with focus on public radio broadcasting and democratic participation. The further juxtaposed the three concepts namely; radio broadcasting (mediated public sphere), democratic participation and *Motsweding* FM (public broadcasting) and the various arguments and different school of thoughts concerning the concepts. The impact of new communication technology and its role in facilitating democratic participation within broadcasting context is discussed. The chapter also interrogated the extent to which talk radio and indigenous language broadcast media and their place in strengthening the democratic process of society by enhancing public participation. The concepts of media and citizenship, the effects of democratic participation, citizen’s political knowledge and political efficacy are also discussed. The chapter concludes with the argument that democratic participation is associated with citizens’ exposure to the news media of which radio broadcasting is usually seen as fundamental aspect of democracy.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to interrogate the theoretical frames of Participatory Liberal, the Habermasian Public Sphere, Empowerment, Anthony Giddens' Structuration and Agenda Setting Theories and their implications to radio broadcasting, participation and democracy. The chapter dovetailed how these theories in the context of radio broadcasting, in particular *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in terms of being able to provide robust and discursive space in which citizens are able to participate in pursuit of healthy democracy. The public sphere is inherently related to deliberative democracy. The deliberative public sphere theorists expand the range of considerations and arguments, and thus foster citizens' understanding and expose them to multiple points of view. Theories of participatory democracy and deliberative democracy claim that citizen participation has positive effects on the quality of democracy.

3.2 Radio Broadcasting and Participatory Liberal Theory

The *Participatory Liberal Theory* of democracy "first and foremost" understands democracy as "the people's business where citizens are the central agents, not the political leaders" (Michels, 2006: 324-325). The democratic theory was developed in the work of Rousseau, J. S. Mill, and G. D. H. Cole which suggests that participation produces popular control of the issue-agenda and decision-making, among others. In John Dewey's (1954), tradition, participatory democratic theorists argue that 'citizens learn by doing'. They learn how to become democratic citizens through participation. Thus, the participatory liberal theory of democracy presents a case for a more vigorous and participatory democratic radio broadcasting in which a "space for free expression and

open debate is guaranteed for all participants” (Singh, 2015: 5). The *Participatory Liberal Theory* is a critical perspective on democracy that mainly focuses on the potential of vigorous citizen participation in “politics both for the citizen as an individual and for the system as a whole. Its central normative criterion is the widest possible empowerment and popular inclusion” (Ferree, Gamson, Gerhards and Rucht, 2002a: 299).

The dominant proposition in participatory liberal democratic theory is that “citizens who actively participate in their self-governance will experience a heightened sense of political efficacy and empowerment” (Hilmer, 2010: 56). Therefore, Aalberg and Curran, (2012: 3), argue that the participatory liberal democratic theorists believe that for democracy to function best, “its citizens should be politically empowered”. For example, while talking politics, people may persuade others, debate with anyone with whom they disagree, and above all, change opinions (Kim and Kim, 2008:62). The act of talking politics together as citizens is in a sense, “an initial act of empowerment which might make participation more meaningful” (Hungbo, 2013: 226). Thus, Barber asserts that “there can be no strong democratic legitimacy without ongoing talk” (2003: 174). This standpoint surmises that democracy undertakes an open state in which citizens are allowed to participate in decision-making, and are given access to the public sphere, and other information networks through which discourse take place (McNair, 2011: 20). Meanwhile, the proponents of empowerment theory hold that empowerment process entails a “democratic participation” (Rappaport, 1987:121) in public life and a “critical understanding of one’s environment” (Zimmerman, Israel, Schulz and Checkoway, 1992: 708). Barber and Rosenwein (1985: 59) suggest that at the core of democratic theory is “the notion that people should get involved in the process of governing themselves”. This view suggests that democratic ideals are in principle participatory tenets. Likewise,

theorists of participatory democracy argue that citizens of a participatory democracy gradually become “educated, effective and empowered because they are continually exerting a high level of control over the social, political, and economic institutions that directly affect their lives” (Hilmer, 2010: 56).

The main focus of participatory liberal theory rests in the critique of the liberal conception of democracy as a “competition for political power among responsible elites. This stands in contrast to liberal democratic theory that stresses the importance of institutions that permit only for the selection of political personnel” (Zittel, 2007: 9-12). The *Participatory Liberal Theory* of democracy is germane to this project given citizen participation on *Motsweding FM's Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs participatory discussion segments constitutes essential component of participatory democracy. The participation of individual citizen in radio broadcast news and current affairs participatory discussion programmes is fundamental to the sustenance of any democratic society (Michels, 2006: 324). Thus, democratic citizen participation constitutes crucial component of participatory liberal democratic theory. Participatory liberal democratic theory appreciates citizens who engage into political decision-making in great numbers and who share a sense of collective responsibility. Its protagonists assert that “this vision can be achieved by increasing opportunities to participate through institutional reform. They argue that the institutional restraints impinging on political participation within the frame of liberal democracy lessen political participation and generate political apathy in the long term, while different institutional impulses are assumed to engender contrasting behavioural effects” (Zittel, 2007: 9-10). Through institutional reform, the participatory liberal democratic theory is founded on empowering citizens by encouraging public debate and contributing towards maximization of information and diverse viewpoints.

However, participatory liberal democratic theory is criticised for failing in three respects. “First, its critics argue that it fails to tell us which particular institutions could have a positive effect on participation. Second, it is criticized for being silent on the contextual conditions under which these institutions might affect political behaviour. Third, participatory theory is denounced for lacking a plausible explanation of how and why particular institutions foster which type of political behaviour” (Zittel, 2007: 10). Critiques of liberal democracy take issue with ‘thin’ democracy associated with elections and opposition politics. According to this interpretation, the liberal democratic theory as an apparatus of political representation appears unproductive in appreciating “the central ideals of democratic politics by facilitating active political participation of citizenry and forging political consensus through dialogue” (Fung and Wright, 2001: 1). Barber (1984) in ‘*Strong Democracy*’ also brings out a critique of liberal democracy or what he calls as “thin” democracy- because of “the marginal role that citizens play in their own governance”. Strong democracy, is a “system in which every member of the community participates in self-governance through ongoing engagement in public affairs. It is not simply a system whereby people elect those who govern them. It entails not merely voting and overseeing representatives, but ongoing participation in the affairs of the civic community at the local and national levels (Barber, 1989:355).

Barber critiques the liberal democracy on the basis that it lacks a definitive moral content and for its reductionist tendencies to see the individual as nothing more than a bundle of appetites (Barber, 1989:355). In contrast to its critics, participatory liberal democratic theory remains a valuable resource in exploring the crucial role of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* concerning their ability to maximise citizen participation in discussing public affairs. From this standpoint, the potential contribution of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele*

news and current affairs to a strong democracy and/or participatory democratic politics is to create and sustain a citizenry that is prepared to participate democratically in public life (Croteau and Hoynes, 2006: 21; Dewey, 1916). A strong democracy thus requires meaningful citizen participation by ongoing wide-ranging public discourse, to which the radio broadcasting can contribute immeasurably. Consequently, the liberal participatory democratic theory prescribes an “informed citizenry” as a vital component of participatory democratic politics (Memoli, 2011:79). Barber (1984: 151-52) argues that participatory politics deals with public disputes and conflicts of interest by subjecting them to a never-ending process of deliberation. In such communities, public ends are neither reasoned from absolutes nor discovered in a pre-existing hidden consensus. They are literally forged through the act of public participation, created through common deliberation and common action and the effect that deliberation and action have on interests, which change shape and direction when subjected to these participatory processes. Cohen and Kahne (2015: 8) understand participatory politics as an interactive, peer-based acts through which citizens seek to exert both voice and influence on issues of public concern.

Gutmann and Thompson (1996) argue that “citizens (ought to) deliberate in a wide variety of settings that valuing their doing so is a natural extension of valuing participation in politics”. Barber (1984: 184) strongly believes that such everyday radio broadcast political talk undertakes the critical functions of a strong democracy. The good citizen should discuss politics with other citizens, and ideally understand the views of others. This interpretation suggests that conversation is a function of talk and gives life to a notion of citizen (Dalton, 2008: 79). Irvin and Stansbury (2004:56) note that once citizens are “informed and involved, they become citizen-experts, they understand technically difficult situations and see things in a holistic manner, and thus contribute” to community-wide

socio-economic and political challenges. Lee (1994: 222) contends that to create a democratically open society, each citizen needs to cultivate a “critical awareness of realities and to use that awareness to participate in and transform society”. Theoretically, democracy thus entails informed citizens who are capable of participating in public affairs. If citizens are to govern themselves, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs arguably attempt to adequately inform citizens by involving them in partaking in public affairs discussions. The establishment of public broadcasting in its institutional systems has had major consequence in modern democratic politics as it became a “forum for debate and discussion on current matters of general concern, and thus a new site for the formation of public opinion” (Collins et al., 1986: 212). *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs discussion segment plays a critical role in giving marginalised citizens a platform to voice diverse opinions. It increases people’s knowledge about ways for them to participate in governance processes, thereby improving individuals’ levels of knowledge in politics and perceived competence to comprehend and deal with politics.

The participatory public broadcast system in indigenous languages stands out as the most capable system in providing rural population who have limited access to English commercial talk radio stations and mainstream commercial newspapers with necessary and sufficient political information (Kellner, 1992: 44). The participatory liberal theory also highlights the principle such as popular inclusion which has implications for public service radio broadcast content. The citizens’ role in the participatory liberal paradigm is active. In order for democracy to flourish, citizens must be actively included in public life and be able to influence each other’s decision making (Strömbäck, 2005: 340). Public service broadcaster of which *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs represent should, therefore, frame politics in a way that motivate citizens’ interest to participate in politics.

Democracy flourishes when citizens participate in public discussion and diverse types of political action, and when they cultivate democratically sound attitudes. Thus, Strömbäck (2005: 339) argues that “the more politically interested and engaged citizens are, the better”. The current affairs presentation of news should let citizens set the agenda for their coverage. Unlike in the traditional message-driven communication activities frequently seen in news production, “where citizens are target audiences to receive life-changing information, citizens’ ability to set agenda becomes a politically empowering way of conceiving communication and allows citizens to have a greater degree of input into and control over their social, cultural, and political environment” (Cornish and Dunn, 2009: 665). This argument is consistent with participatory theorists who argue that meaningful citizen participation in public affairs “not only leads to better decision making, but it also facilitates social stability by developing a sense of community, increasing collective decision making, and promoting acceptance and respect of the governance process” (Callahan, 2007).

The ‘participatory liberal theory tradition’ typically shares with the “discursive and constructionist traditions” which hold that preferences and capacities for judging public issues materialise in the process of citizen deliberation (Ferree et al., 2002a: 296). Dryzek (2002) argues that deliberation is the dominant approach in democratic theory. The idea of deliberative democracy thus builds upon the “themes of democracy and citizens’ communicative interaction in civil society/public spheres, and emphasises the formation of political will” (Dahlgren, 2002:14). The proponents of deliberative theory pay more attention on the character of participation which is deliberation. The theory of deliberative democracy is grounded on criticisms of “more episodic forms of democratic participation, where public deliberation is limited to issue ‘sound bites’” and popularity contests (Parkins

and Mitchell, 2005: 533). In the context of mediated public sphere, public deliberation refers to what Dryzek (1994) call “discursive democracy”. The discursive democracy and/or deliberative democracy rests on the idea that citizens participate not only in registering preferences, but also in deliberate about those preferences (Wright and Street, 2007: 850). The protagonist of deliberative democracy focuses upon how to attain more rational-critical debate within communicative spaces (Dryzek, 2002). In other words, deliberative democratic theory is “concerned with debate and discussion aimed at producing reasonable and well-informed opinion in which listeners are willing to revise preferences in light of discussion, new information, and claims” made by fellow listeners (Chambers 2003: 309).

McNair, Hibberd, and Schlesinger (2002: 407-422) state that deliberative democracy could contribute to a vigorous public sphere where radio listeners can “exchange ideas, acquire knowledge and information, confront public problems, exercise public accountability, discuss public policy options and challenge the powerful without fear of reprisals” through their robust participation in the public sphere. Gastil (2000: 358) claims that in deliberative democracy, the potential benefits of mediated public deliberation include “more informed and reflective judgments, a greater sense of political efficacy, and an increase in the frequency of political action”. In particular, democratic theories emphasizing political deliberation “attach a significant value to political discussion among members of the public. They view discussion of political issues among citizens as critical to the key processes of well-functioning democratic systems, such as the production of political legitimacy, and healthy patterns of government responsiveness to the public will” (Moy et al., 2005: 115). Fundamental to deliberative democratic theory is thus become “the mode of participation, that is, deliberation among citizens” (Hilmer, 2010: 52). Like

democratic participation, democratic deliberation is very much “concerned with participation in democratic processes, nonetheless deliberative democrats unequivocally emphasize the character of the processes, with the starting point that diverse views have to be adjusted or confronted by means of argumentation” (Englund, 2006: 511). Thus, Robert Dahl (1989) suggests the possibility to inform oneself as a standard of democratic process is rooted in terms of “enlightened understanding” of public issues. This is the soul of the argument made by Page (1996: 1) as he claims that “public deliberation is essential to democracy”.

The proponents of deliberative democratic ideas, on the other hand state that realizing the idea of democracy should be based not only on representation and voting mechanisms, but also on processes including the search for information and arguments, and weighing of pros and cons of various opinions and values until reaching informed decisions (Bohman, 1998; Gutmann and Thompson 2004; Fishkin 2009). In a nutshell, just like participatory theorists, deliberative democratic theory asserts that citizen participation through radio broadcasting has positive effects on democracy. It contributes to the inclusion of individual citizens in the public debate, encourages civic skills and civic virtues and leads to critical rational decisions making among citizens based on public reasoning (Michels and De Graaf, 2010: 481). This argument suggests that discussion of political issues among citizens is “an activity essential to deliberative democracy” (Hilmer, 2010:53). The public sphere theory is thus central to the ideals of deliberative democracy which are based on the idea that citizens of a democratic society should have access to an impartial and independent public broadcaster established as a genuine critical organ of public participation in political discussion where arguments from a rationalised public opinion are publicly exchanged.

3.3. The Habermasian Public Sphere Theory and Radio Broadcasting

The key institutional embodiment of democratic participation is the public sphere. The term 'public sphere' is mostly associated with the German sociologist Jürgen Habermas. In *The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article* by Jürgen Habermas (1964), the public sphere is defined as:

“A realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed. Access is guaranteed to all citizens. A portion of the public sphere comes into being in every *conversation* in which private individuals assemble to form a public body. They then behave neither like business or professional people transacting private affairs, nor like members of a constitutional order subject to the legal constraints of a state bureaucracy. Citizens behave as a public body when they confer in an unrestricted fashion. that is, with the guarantee of freedom of assembly and association and the freedom to express and publish their opinions- about matters of general interest. In a large public body this kind of communication requires specific means for transmitting information and influencing those who receive it. Today newspapers and magazines, radio and television are the media of the public sphere” (Habermas, 1964: 49).

Habermas' notion of the public sphere locates it “outside the state and the market and conceives of it as an institutionalised platform from which citizens produce and circulate discourses with the potential to influence and control the activities of the state. The public sphere is, therefore, an avenue for the generation of political participation through talk, an important underpinning for democratic associations which complement the state apparatuses and the market institutions of modern capitalist society” (Mustapha, 2012b: 28). Habermas used the term in his book *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* which was published in 1962 in German but translated into English in 1989 and has since then become very influential. In this book, Habermas argues that the emergence of capitalism in European feudal

societies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries enabled a new sphere or space for the exchange of ideas through rational communication. The public sphere is treated as a fundamental building blocks of liberal-democratic political theory and considered as essential to a well-functioning liberal democracy. He argued that this space may be conceived as a sphere where private people come together as public and discuss matters of common concern (Habermas, 1989: 27). In the case of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs, the function of the format and role that the programmes play in the “political and social structure” can best be viewed through the concept of the public sphere (Crider, 2012:226). The public sphere must meet the following institutional features to function effective as noted by Garnham (1986). He notes the following key features underpinning public sphere:

It was *protected* from the power of both church and state by its access to the sustaining resources of a wide range of private individuals with an alternative source of economic power. It was in principle *open* to all in the same way that access to the market was open to all. This Public Sphere thus took on the *universalistic* aspects of the Hegelian state, membership of the public sphere being conterminous with citizenship. All participants within the public sphere were, as with the competitive market, on terms of equal power because costs of participation were widely and evenly spread and because social wealth in general, within the bourgeoisie, was evenly distributed. On the other hand, it was *distinct* from the private interests that govern civil society because, in the Enlightenment tradition, it obeyed the rules of *rational discourse*, political views and decisions being open, not to the play of power, but to that of *argument* based upon evidence, and because its concern was not private interest but the public good. It thus also took over the *rationalist* aspects of the Hegelian state (Garnham, 1986: 40-41).

This public sphere, as Karin Wahl-Jorgensen (2008: 963) argues, was dominated by a “visual metaphor as stressed physicality in which participants were expected to be united in a public square with citizens being present to one another”. In other words, the

participants were simultaneously sharing a common locale and their participation was oral, based on the issues of common concern within that locale. Wahl-Jorgensen (2008: 963) also contends that Habermas “disembodies the public sphere from the Greek model by saying that the public evolves into the reading public with the advent of Enlightenment and modernity. This is more a virtual community of authors, readers and writers, and one does not need to be present to one another physically. But this reading public is at the same time also the embodiment of critical public opinion”. Habermas’ conception of the public sphere, functioned mostly through “face-to-face interaction in *coffee-houses* and *salons*, and through an independent press, which both staged reasoned debate and represented public opinion to government” (Curran, 2002:33).

The modern public sphere is mediated and operates in completely different socio-economic and political environment from that which Habermas envisioned and so its mode of participation. The contemporary mediated public sphere of which *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs represents is constrained by ownership and control, structures, regulations and processes as stated in the background and context of the study previously. The mode of citizen participation in the mediated public sphere is through phone-ins, Facebook text messages, and is also complex as it is determined by economics. That is the ability to afford airtime and data; hence, the programmes have regular callers. Its citizens are what Anderson (1983:1-207) refers to as “imagined communities”, residing in different locales, but brought together, in this instance, by Setswana Language. *Motsweding* FM’s *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes as public sphere, enables this imagined community to articulate “a common future in terms of genuinely common goods by transforming strangers into citizen-neighbours” through conversation (Barber, 1984: 197).

The public sphere, with its deliberative and democratic potential, has however, not persisted criticism. The public sphere in the words of Mouffe (1999: 756) is “neither so harmonious nor rational and so unified, as Habermas would like it to be. Instead, the public sphere is seen as an arena of (antagonistic and agonistic) contention, of opposing and conflicting discourses”. The democratic critics of the public sphere conception as reflected through Habermas’ theory of communicative rationality have argued that it supports exclusive political discourse for three reasons. Firstly, the public sphere, according to the critics, promotes a rationalist form of discourse that devalues aesthetic affective styles of interaction. This results in certain groups’ ways of speaking being privileged over others. Secondly, it assumes that power can be separated from communication, which masks exclusion and domination. And lastly, it promotes consensus as the purpose of deliberation, which marginalizes voices that do not readily agree (Dahlberg, 2005: 113-129). Critics have also pointed out that Habermas’ emphasis on ‘rational-critical debate’ is grounded on an “elitist conception of liberal democracy” (Willems, 2011).

Many accounts argue that democratization has failed to take roots in most post-colonial countries as a result of the imposition of liberal democracy from external actors. Most African scholars contend that the liberal democracy, dominated by a narrow neoliberal focus on the individuals does not reflect the whole reality of personhood and agency in Africa, which is a lot more complex than provided in liberal democratic systems (Mamdani, 2012; Ake, 2000, Nyamnjoh, 2005). For example, Santos (2012: 44) argues that “the theoretical and cultural presuppositions of Habermas’ public sphere are entirely European. Some of the criticisms include the fact that it is based on the individual bourgeois and life experience; it assumes the separation between the state and civil

society; it sees the bourgeois citizen and his public sphere as external to the structure of power; it takes for granted its informal and equal inclusiveness, its dynamic component is the reasonable discussion and a culturally shared discourse through which a consensus is reached on matters of common concern; and political action consists of political discussion, not political action and transformation". In understanding the African public sphere, Mustapha (2012a: 5) contends that "we must also pay attention to the connections between the public and the private spheres, as well as between the social and the personal". Garnham's (1986) also critique Habermas' public sphere on the basis of 'universality' and 'individualistic' terms. In relation to the idea of universal access, he states that access to the public sphere was in fact far from being universal but was restricted to bourgeois male.

On the point of "individualistic terms", he argues that the public sphere and the concept of a rational politics that goes with it, "it seems whole unrealistic that all participants possess complete information and engage in all debates" (Garnham, 1986:43-44). Nancy Fraser has also contributed to the critique of the Habermasian public sphere. Fraser's fundamental contribution lies in highlighting that, apart from its "classism, the public sphere is permeated by the gender, racial and heteronormative system, and so the dominant form of occupying the public space (male and bourgeois) creates a multiplicity of publics" (Fraser, 1990:56-80). The most common criticism of the public sphere is its ideological orientation. It is claimed that "it stands as a norm of rational-critical discourse obscures its bias towards the voices of particular groups in society" (Dahlberg, 2005: 113). The Habermasian public sphere theory and its deliberative conception, despite shortcomings, thus provides a benchmark to evaluate *Motsweding FM's Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs' discussions segment in relation to such

standards as civility, direct engagement of opposing viewpoints, and reasoned argumentation (Wessler, 2008; Ferree et al., 2002a: 232–254). Habermas' conception of the public sphere is useful in this project as it provides the most systematically developed standards needed for carefully investigating the “democratic quality of everyday interactions” (Dahlberg, 2014: 2-18). The theory, although having its historical origins in ancient Greece (Dewey 1954) remains a fundamental investigative framework in contemporary democratic society because of its link to public service broadcasting institution which is “viewed to have elective affinity with public life and to be the best guarantee of its survival in the era of state organised, consumer capitalism” (Keane 1995: 8). *Motsweding FM, Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs' discussions segment thus encompasses Habermasian public sphere principles. These platforms are in principle open to all citizens to express their public opinion about the subject matter of public interest and thus contributing to public information and argumentation which are critical to the preservation of democracy (Iosifidis, 2011: 621-628).

The programmes' objective is to establish platform of public debate which optimize diversity in terms of information, viewpoints and forms of expression, and which foster full and active citizenship. The programmes attempt to create a platform for critical-rational deliberation about the exercise of both political and economic powers. They provide an “institutional sites where popular political will take form and citizens able to constitute themselves as active agents in the political process” (Dahlgren, 1991: 11). The programmes have the potential of enhancing civic engagement, and promoting political culture of public participation thereby reducing ‘democratic deficit’ among marginalised citizens in the era of commodification of the communications media. The public sphere theory, thus, calls for a rethink about the role of open-platform public service broadcasting

in terms of facilitating the process of rational argumentation by providing a context of public discourse which is essential for the formation of free and reason-based public opinion. Thus, a well-functioning public broadcasting depends on both “access to pertinent information about the actions of governmental institutions and opportunities for citizens to engage in rational-critical deliberation that result in the formation of public opinion and the shaping of governmental conduct as the space between civil society and the state in which citizens can debate issues of common concern” (Haas, 2004: 179). The theory emphasises that citizen participation in deliberative settings may contribute to more rational decisions making based on public reasoning. Thus, rational-critical deliberation is afforded necessary attention.

3.4 Radio Broadcasting and Empowerment Theory

Theories of participatory, the public sphere and deliberative democracy propose empowered citizenry as a crucial aspect of democratic politics. Whereas, the empowerment theory proposes “that actions, activities, or structure may be empowering, and that the outcome of such process results in a level of being empowered” (Zimmerman, 2000: 45). The *Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999* which is the structure with which the *Motsweding* FM exists and operates obliges it to empower, enrich and strengthen citizens cultural, socio-economic and political context within which they live. Thus, empowerment is structurally dependent upon an individual’s or groups’ relationship with the political and mediated system within which those individuals or groups are situated (Savigny, 2013: 13-16). Sotirovic and McLeod (2004: 357-395) contend that citizens of democracies must understand “the processes and structures of the political system around them” in order to participate in meaningful manner. Theoretically, an ideal democracy would contain citizens who have “high levels of political knowledge,

efficacy, and participation” (Kenski and Stroud, 2006:174). Henning and Renblad (2009) also argue that a society in which "people feel empowered, is a society which fosters participation democracy politics”. Empowerment theory postulates that participation in decision making may enhance one's sense of empowerment and that empowered citizens are likely to be active in public life (Kieffer, 1984; Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988). Therefore, the capacity to “act and participate, as well as the feeling that one has the right to do so, is central to empowerment” (Renblad, 2003: 28).

The theory of empowerment is essential in this study as the act of democratic citizen participation in *Motsweding FM*, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs’ discussions segment signifies a process that may lead to citizen’s critical understanding of their socio-economic and political environment. In Higgins’ (1999: 289) words, citizen empowerment seems to “capture an individual's right and responsibility to partake in the life of the community, as well as a feeling of connection with that community and a sense of being able to successfully contribute to, and assume some control over, its political and social life”. With regard to this view, Samah and Aref, (2009: 65) argue that individual's empowerment can, therefore, take place in the society, and as a group they could possibly exert collective empowerment towards achieving 'power over', by influencing and adjusting the power relationship within the unobservable power structure. The theory suggests that ‘empowerment’ involves experiences of power; these experiences of empowerment are situated and contextualized by mediated political and social environment. Thus, a healthy democratic public broadcaster should empower the citizens to discuss, share and impart information concerning political, social and cultural issues affecting their live (Staples, 1990). Accordingly, a vigorous democratic public broadcaster should empower the citizens to discuss, share and impart information concerning political,

social and cultural issues affecting their lives. To be 'empowered' as political value is to have knowledge of the structures which "shape and define that which is possible and that which it is not" (Savigny, 2013: 20). In the context of 'broadcasting and citizen democratic participation', citizen empowerment refers to the public radio broadcastings' ability to ensure that citizens' acquire knowledge with a view to restoring and serving a model of democratic governance usually based upon normative conceptualization of the relationship amongst citizens while maximizing their power (Gerodimos, Scullion, Lilleker and Jackson, 2013:1). The public broadcaster of which *Motsweding* FM exemplify conceit itself on the idea of broadcasting for citizen empowerment. The programmes, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs provide a political context in which citizens engage with each other by holding elites to account and establish political meaning in the world around them through debate (Savigny, 2013: 16).

However, Fenton and Barassi (2011) and Stiegler (2009) argue that what other scholars call empowerment as a result of citizen participation is not really empowerment but a drive to push self/ individualised interest. According to Fenton and Barassi's (2011: 179-196), critique of empowerment theory is far from being empowering. The debates on the democratic potential of radio broadcast talk have often been constrained by a focus on individual agency, and by the assumption that, through individual participation and a realization of the politics of the self, people will connect to wider movements where significant political transformations and social change can take place. In this circumstance, political participation is construed through the role of the individual. In contrast, Stiegler (2009) believes that the processes of individuation and of speaking out hold the key to empowerment, agency, and resistance. Notwithstanding the criticisms, *Motsweding* FM, news and current affairs programmes *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele*

empower citizens to “gain mastery over their personal affairs” and to have influence over the political situation that affect their lives through public talk (Rappaport, 1987; Perkins and Zimmerman, 1995). Zimmerman (2000: 50) states that audience’s capacity to analyse and understand social and political environment includes an ability to understand casual agents their connection to the issues of concern, and the factors that influence decision making. Audience’s critical understanding refers to citizens’ capacity to evaluate and understand their social and political environment. Therefore, empowerment is enacted through the doing of media-making within a given community; the community affirms and verifies its power through its media production practices (Macgilchrist, 2013: 99).

Theorists of participatory democracy contend that participatory radio broadcast programmes should provide citizens with a multitude of opportunities to learn how to be effective citizens. These opportunities arise when citizens have access both to the information necessary to make effective political judgments and to the political, social, and economic institutions that affect their everyday lives (Hilmer, 2010: 58). In other words, the public broadcaster should make “available information affecting the public good, and facilitate a free, open and reasoned public dialogue that guides the public direction of society” (Curran, 2000: 135). This is specifically what *Motsweding* FM’s news and current affairs programmes’ discussion segment aim to achieve by providing a platform for the communicative generation of public opinion in ways that arguably empower citizens. Moreover, theories of deliberative democracy in relation to the theory of empowerment hold that “if citizens were more broadly empowered, especially in the institutions that most directly affect their everyday lives, their experiences would have transformative effects. Citizens would become more public spirited, more tolerant, more

knowledgeable, more attentive to the interests of others, and more probing of their own interests. Transformations such as these would improve the workings of higher-level representative institutions, as well as mitigate threats that democracy is often held to pose to rights, pluralism, and governability” (Warren, 1996: 241). This suggests that robust and vibrant democratic public broadcast system presupposes an engaged citizenry (Gurevich and Blumler, 1990: 25). This deliberative turn is often viewed as vital to the production of sound public opinion and effective democracy.

The empowerment theory further suggests that citizens must participate in those “decisions that affect their lives, thus gaining confidence, self-esteem and knowledge, and developing new skills” (Javan, 1998). Therefore, citizen’s empowerment, involves citizen’s ability to acquire knowledge in order to influence critically socio-economic and political environment affecting his/her life. The public broadcaster can be central to citizen empowerment to the extent to which it identifies key social, political and economic issues of the day that are likely to affect the welfare of citizens (Gurevitch and Blumler, 1990). Empowered citizens discuss politics with other citizens and ideally understand the views of others (Dalton, 2008: 79). As citizens participate in *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs politics, “they gain political skills and perceptions of self-competence”, qualities thought essential for popular self-government and effective control over one’s political surroundings (Finkel, 1985: 893). Ideally, empowerment “connects citizen’s well-being with the larger social and political environment, and suggests that people need opportunity to become active in public decision-making in order to improve their lives because they may develop a greater understanding of the decision-making process” (Zimmerman, 2000: 58). This implies that ‘political empowerment’ exemplifies the formation of democratic systems “in which all citizens can participate in a manner in which

they are heard and can influence in each other” (Anderson et al., 1994: 83). Political ‘empowerment’ then is understood in the context of citizens’ contribution to “making democracy vigorous” (Eyben et al., 2008: 14). Chambers (2003: 318) notes that a fundamental principle of all deliberative theory is that deliberation can change minds and transform opinions which is arguably equivalent to empowerment. The perspective that citizen participation “transforms individuals into engaged citizens” suggests that radio broadcast news and current affairs ‘content’ should “first and foremost encourage empowerment” (Ferree et al. 2002a: 297). Zimmerman (2000: 55-58) postulates that “empowered citizens” are expected to have participatory public broadcasting institution that enhance opportunities for citizens to participate and engage in matters of common concern, news commentary and analysis open to multiple perspectives to encourage critical discussions among citizens.

Likewise, the public broadcaster in pursuit of citizen empowerment should provide a marketplace for the exchange of comment and criticism regarding public affairs (Ansah, 1988: 7). These perspectives reveal the two central normative democratic functions of the public broadcaster, which demand the public broadcaster to guarantee a public forum or a marketplace of ideas where all social groups can express and exchange their interests and demands and provide all citizens with information about politics, public affairs and the activities of the political elites (Müller, 2010: 4). Moy et al., (2005: 111-113) also maintain that “civically engaged citizen participating in a lively public sphere is the mainstay of any democratic system. They contend that a healthy democracy presumes active citizens who have adequate and equal opportunity to express their preferences and reasoning” in influencing public decision-making process. The same argument is put forward by Sirianni and Friedland (2001: 20) who state that “healthy democracy” requires

extended learning through “conversation and discussions” that “conversation and discussions” should “carefully examine a problem and a range of solutions through an open, inclusive exchange” of views and perspectives (Gastil, 2008).

Another central principle of participatory democratic theory in relation to empowerment theory is that “citizens’ political astuteness increases the more often they participate in their self-government lives” (Hilmer, 2010: 58). From the perspective of participatory democracy, broadcast political debate should have beneficial or positive effects on the citizens’ moral and political empowerment (Mason, 1982; Pateman, 1970). As Sinikks Sassi (2001:120) puts it, the “ideal subject has been that of a vigilant citizen who must be properly informed about what is going on and be extremely active politically”. Citizens’ democratic participation in public broadcast deliberation therefore plays a critical role because it develops their capacities to understand different perspectives, their “ability to communicate their understandings to other people, and engage in the give-and-take of moral argument with a view to making mutually acceptable decisions” (Englund, 2006: 512). In this way, the public broadcaster should allow citizens to “set agenda on different national activities by expressing their opinion and contribute to the progress of the nation, it thus acts as the fourth estate” (Masmoudi, 1992: 34). The notion of democratic participation which speaks to the concept of broadcasting for citizen’s empowerment presupposes access to information by citizens to enable them to participate meaningfully in public discussion and decision-making. A major task of public broadcaster, therefore, “should not frame ordinary citizens as passive victims of forces they cannot change, but as active subjects with possibilities as well as responsibilities to change what needs to be changed through deliberation on public affairs” (Strömbäck, 2005: 340). Though, it is important to note that the extent to which collective empowerment is able to affect the

existing structure depends upon the degree of the relationship that people have with the structure in general, and the extent to which they are 'devoted' to the social or power structure in particular.

3.5 Giddens' Structuration Theory and its Implications to Public Broadcasting

The most famous attempts at integration of agency and structure in sociological theory are represented in Anthony Giddens' (1984) structuration theory. According to Giddens (1984:17), structure refers to the structuring properties allowing the binding of time-space in social systems, the properties which make it possible for discernibly similar social practices to exist across varying spans of time and space which lend them systemic form. Structure in most elementary meaning refers to rules and resources. Structuration theory is a constructivist theory because "it understands people as social constructs and maintains that institutions of all types are constructs sustained by how people act, and they act according to their images of reality" (Lye, 1997). The main proposition of structuration theory is that the rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time the means of system reproduction (the duality of structure) (Giddens, 1984:17). In this sense, news personnel are relatively determined, and as such, in everyday life news personnel can be "both agents of reproducing and simultaneously restructuring the structure, that is, social and power structure" (Samah and Aref, 2009: 65). Anthony Giddens' (1984) structuration theory is pertinent to this study because the Broadcasting Act No 4 of 1999, Charter of the SABC, editorial policies and *Motsweding FM*'s licence conditions can be understood in the context of the structures, processes, laws and regulation, time and resources which constrain and enable *Motsweding FM* personnel in the production of news and current affairs. As Vincent Mosco (2009: 186) writes "structure provides the medium out of which

agency” operates. He further explains that “social action takes place within constraints and the opportunity provided by the structure within which action happens” (Mosco, 2009: 16).

The concept of structuration brings together “structure and agency to give them flow – continuity, but also the possibility of structural change” (Whittington, 2015:149). Agency for Giddens (1984: 9), is not “the intention people have to act, but rather their capacity for acting in the first place, implying ‘power to do’, and is achieved by access to, and application of, structural properties (the rules and resources), which generate modalities of social control. In this sense, power, is the agent’s ability and capacity to monitor actions, provide a rationale for their actions and to act otherwise, consistent with Giddens’ (1991: 200) claim that “all social rules are transformational”. Thus the “power relations may be manifested or even constituted within everyday routines and ethos of workaday journalism” (Hackett, 2006: 7). SABC journalists, according to these views, draw what constitute news from the *Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999, Charter of the Corporation* which requires the corporation to provide the highest standards of journalism that meet ideal of objectivity, factual and balance reporting of the opposing viewpoint. Layder (1994:139) states that when ‘rules and resources’ are combined they “enable people to do things”. That means that the Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999, Charter of the Corporation enables *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs producers to decide on who goes on air and prescribe the time limits of opinion expression as well as excluding those who hold different views or being perceived to be taking different stance altogether from what is being in the agenda. The structure (*Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999*) in line with this thinking provides the agency (journalists and news and current affairs production team) with the guideline of selecting newsworthy events. Essentially,

this perspective, suggests that *Motsweding FM* or SABC journalistic activities are influenced or guided by the structure (*Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999*) “but at the same time journalists are capable of changing the social structure” (Samah and Aref, 2009: 65). In other words, the structure provides journalist with tools to determine what news is and what is not news, who to participate and excluded from participation. This implies that the “institutional design of participatory spaces has a significant impact on who participates and on which terms” (Barnes, Knops, Newman and Sullivan, 2004). The structural features have powerful short-term effects on programme choice and listening patterns but over time their collective media consumption behaviour may shape the very structures within which they operate (Webster 2009: Yuan and Ksiazek, 2011).

Moreover, the notion of duality of structure appears to be central to Giddens’ Structuration theory. According to the notion of the duality of structure in his words, “the structural properties of social systems are both medium and outcome of the practices they recursively organise. Structure is not ‘external’ to individual; as memory traces, and as instantiated in social practices, it is in the certain sense more ‘internal’ than exterior to their activities” (Giddens, 1984: 19-25). He further reiterates that “structure is not to be equated with constraints but is always both constraining and enabling” (1984: 19-25). The structure outline what is worth discussing and what isn’t. The structuration theory, has however, been criticised on the basis of “conflating structure and human agent, the complexity and the outspread of the theory that lead to contradictions, and the lack of assumptions and methodological guideline” (Kort and El Gharbi, 2013). Archer (1996) states that “this conflation reduces the analytical perspective because it leads to a non-gathering between concepts such as interaction and social system. It is more appropriate to distinguish between people and society features”. Hence, Archer (1990) withstands the

analytical separation between structure and agency. Indeed, Layder (2006) postulates that “the simultaneous constitution of action and structure do not allow the assessment of the relative impact of structure or that of agent”. However, he adds that “It is difficult to analyse the way in which structural features may predominate in certain areas at certain times, while the creative and transformative activities of people may come to the fore” (Layder, 2006: 185).

The structuration theory, in spite of criticism, is useful to this study of radio broadcasting and citizen’s democratic participation because it helps us understand the internal decision making processes and how the internal structure of the organisation encourage or discourage citizen participation. In addition, to certain extent, external factors (e.g. political and economic reasons) influencing internal decision-making processes might impact on citizen’s participation by encouraging or discouraging citizens from participating in broadcast discourse. In other words, the *Broadcasting Act No. 4 of 1999*, the Charter of the Corporation and the SABC’s Editorial Policy are fundamental to the daily operation of *Motsweding FM*. Thus, structuration theory can be employed to explore how radio broadcasting “produce, reproduce, and transform journalistic practice through social interaction across time and space” (Giddens, 1984). He further states that “rules are like procedures or formulas, which individuals follow in social practice, that cannot always be spoken about and are reproduced or changed during action. Resources are used to generate power as people draw from them during action”. (Giddens, 1984:17–25). In other words, the structure, with reference to the *Broadcasting Act No; 4 of*, both enables and constrains *Motsweding FM* journalistic activity/ agency (Yuan and Thomas, 2011: 182). The structuration theory further, explains the media framing of public issues highlighted as important for public debate, whereas audience follow media narratives.

Narratives are “organizations of experience,” writes Manoff (1987), “They bring order to events by making them something that can be told about; they have power because they make the world make sense”. Media sociologists have come to rely increasingly on the concept of frame (Tuchman, 1978a, Gitlin, 1980, Lang and Lang, 1983, Gamson and Modigliani, 1989). Frame plays the same role in analysing media discourse that schema does in cognitive psychology-a central organizing principle that holds together and gives coherence and meaning to a diverse array of symbols (Gamson et al., 1992: 373).

Media frames as Gitlin (1980) writes, “largely unspoken and unacknowledged, organize the world both for journalists who report it and, in some important degree, for us who rely on their reports”. As used by Goffman (1974), the concept of frame maintains a useful tension or balance between structure and agency. Goffman warns us that “organizational premises are involved, and those are something cognition arrives at, not something cognition creates or generates”. In other words, events and experiences are framed; on the same equation, “we frame events and experiences” (Gamson et al., 1992: 384). Chong (1993: 870) describes framing as “the essence of public opinion formation”. Framing can be considered an extension of agenda-setting as it “is the selection of a restricted number of thematically related attributes for inclusion on the media agenda when a particular object is discussed” (McCombs, 1997: 6). Framing arises when in “the progress of describing an issue or event, the presenter stress on a subset of potentially relevant considerations causes individuals to focus on these considerations when constructing” their opinion (Druckman, 2001:226-231). *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs frame the discussion to the extent that the production teams “select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal

interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (McCombs, 2005: 546). In this way, the public broadcaster of which *Motsweding FM* represent set the agenda by defining the world through news and commentary for public consumption. The central argument in this version suggests that the dominant system of ideas and representations relayed by *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs provides the means by which people ordinarily ‘live’ (i.e. selectively experience) an imaginary relationship to their real conditions of existence (Althusser, 1984).

The notion of Agenda Setting by the media can be traced back to Walter Lippmann (1922) who submitted that the media were responsible for “the pictures in our heads”. Cohen (1963) articulated the concept further when he argued that “the media may not always be successful in telling people what to think, but they are usually successful in telling people what to think about”. Lang and Lang (1966: 468) emphasised this idea by noting “The mass media force attention to certain issues...They are constantly presenting objects, suggesting what individuals in the mass should think about, know about, have feelings about”. McCombs and Shaw (1972: 176) argue that “in choosing and displaying news, editors, newsroom staff, and broadcasters play an important part in shaping political reality. Readers learn not only about a given issue, but also how much importance to attach to that issue from the amount of information in a news story and its position”. Agenda setting is commonly attributed to the framing theory. Although agenda-setting is concerned with the salience of issues, frame-setting, or second-level agenda-setting is concerned with the salience of issue attributes by framing political events and issues by elites in particular manner (Scheufele, 2000: 298). The Agenda Setting Theory is useful in this project because it helpfull us understand how *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs production personnel set agenda for mediated debate by identifying

the main topic for public discussion. The Agenda Setting Theory states that the media are prevalent in focusing public attention on particular events, issues and persons and in shaping the significance people ascribe to public matters (Shaw, 1999). It could be argued that the identification of the main topic for discussion might impact on citizen participation or discourage citizens from participating in the media discourse due to their interest on the issue as opposed to what is normally referred to as open mike democratic participation.

The theory suggests that the public broadcaster' editorial team determines what gains prominence and what recedes into the background, what is included and what is excluded. They provide "window to the world" (Curran, 2002: 163). In addition to providing 'windows on the world' offering selective perspectives, the public broadcasters also "signify and interpret the events. They provide explicit frameworks of explanation, as well as tacit understandings based on associations of ideas, evocative images, and 'natural' chains of thought. They also furnish codes that label and classify, by for example, distinguishing between the normal and deviant, natural and unnatural. The public broadcaster both maps the social world and explains its workings" (Curran, 2002: 163). The public broadcasters of which *Motsweding* FM represent may in setting the agenda and framing issues influence whether or not people choose to participate politically and which activities they choose to participate in.

3.6 Summary

This chapter aimed to interrogate the theoretical frames of Participatory Liberal, the Habermasian Public Sphere, Empowerment, Anthony Giddens' Structuration and Agenda Setting Theories and their implications to radio broadcasting, participation and

democracy. The chapter dovetailed how these theories in the context of radio broadcasting, in particular *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in terms of being able to provide robust and discursive space in which citizens are able to participate in pursuit of healthy democracy. The public sphere is inherently related to deliberative democracy. The deliberative public sphere theorists expand the range of considerations and arguments, and thus foster citizens' understanding and expose them to multiple points of view. Theories of participatory democracy and deliberative democracy claim that citizen participation has positive effects on the quality of democracy.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents research methodology and design used to investigate the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest of democratic participation. The study adopts mixed-method research approach. That is, the combination of a series of both qualitative and quantitative methods to access and analyse data in a single study to better understand the research problem (Creswell, 2012). The study is predominantly qualitative, that is mixed methods research in which the researcher combines research methods to investigate, collects, analyses and draws inferences from both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or a program of inquiry. That provided a better understanding of research problems that either approach alone. This research approach provides the researchers with the freedom to collect, analyses, mix, and draw inferences from both quantitative and qualitative methods. In this way, the researchers were free to choose the methods, techniques, and procedures of research which were best to meet the needs and purposes of the study. The methods applied in data collection, analysis and presentation are explained. The chapter further explain the population of the study, the sampling procedure and sampling techniques as well as ethical consideration.

4.2 Mixed Method Research Methodology

Mixed methods research is defined by Cameron (2011: 96), as a research in which the researcher “collects, analyses, mixes, and draws inferences from both quantitative and qualitative data” in a single study. The convergence of both quantitative and qualitative “adds strength to the findings as the various strands of data are braided together to promote a greater understanding of the case” (Baxter and Jack, 2008: 554). The study is predominantly premised on qualitative case study to explore in depth the concept of radio

broadcasting and the quest for democratic participation on *Motsweding* FM. The combination of “multiple sources of empirical material in a case study method is best understood as a strategy to add rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to the study” (Flick, Kardorff and Steinke, 2004). Unique in comparison to other qualitative approaches is that within case study research, investigators can collect and integrate quantitative survey data which facilitate reaching a holistic understanding of the phenomenon being studied. The qualitative case study research methodology offers tools for investigators to study complex phenomena within their contexts (Baxter and Jack, 2008: 544). Yin (2009: 18) defines case-study as an inquiry that “investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context when boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used”. Miles and Huberman (1994: 25) explain the case as a “phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context. The case is, in effect, is the unit of analysis”.

Motsweding FM news and current affairs, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* programmes were selected as unit of analysis. The case study design is considered when the focus of the study is to answer “how” and “why” questions. The case study may be selected when “the inquirer cannot influence the behaviour of those participating in the study; when the researcher wants to cover contextual conditions because of believing that they are significant to the phenomenon under study; and or when the boundaries are not clear between the phenomenon and context” (Yin, 2003: 7). Thus, qualitative research methodology helps in “the exploration of a phenomenon within some particular context through various data sources, and it undertakes the exploration through variety of lenses in order to reveal multiple facets of the phenomenon” (Baxter and Jack, 2008: 544). Qualitative research methodology involves “an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the

world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013: 399-401). Therefore, qualitative research is appropriate in exploring the perspectives of producers and presenters of *Motsweding* FM’ news and current affairs ‘content production’ because it allows investigators to gain an understanding of the totality of a participant’s experience in the context of their day to day activity. On the other hand, “survey” research strategy associated with the quantitative approach were conducted to get audience’s perception towards the station’s potential to encourage citizen democratic participation and empowerment (Cresswell, 2003: 14). A survey produces “quantitative information about the social world and describes features of the people or social world” (Neuman, 1997: 228). The questionnaire was distributed and explained to the participants who expressed the willingness to participate and collected upon completion. Thus, the point of departure for research on broadcast media and democratic participation should be “the perspectives of citizens themselves” (Robins, Cornwall and von Lieres, 2008: 1085). Couldry, Livingstone and Markham (2007: 65) talk about a “mediated public connection” where the point of departure for investigating the citizens’ role of the media, is “from the viewpoint of the citizens themselves”.

4.3 Determining the Type of Case Study

The type of the case study adopted in this research to understand the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest for democratic participation is the ‘embedded case study’. This is because the research investigates *Motsweding* FM (one of the 18 SABC radio station) as the case. In addition, the two programmes, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes are selected. Thus, Yin (2009: 50) states that embedded case study involves more than one-unit object of analysis. It also allows for a

multiplicity of methods that may be applied within the subunits. The subunits of the main focus in this study was *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs episodes aired between July, August and September 2018. That covers a period of three months. The choice of the period was neither based on specific events like elections, national or local. This is so because the study understands democratic participation as the 'process' by which ordinary citizens' interests, desires, preferences and demands are continuously communicated in mediated public discourse (Verba, Nie, and Kim, 1971: 9). The concept participation is inextricably intertwined with democracy, which fundamentally refers to the inclusion of people in the democratic processes (Avril and Neem, 2015: 2). The notion 'participation' in mediated public sphere context, means the act of citizens taking part in the mediated public discussion to influence, contribute and/or challenge decision-making process (Sartori, 1987: 113). Thus, it is essential for citizens to continuously participate in public debate to exercise certain degree of influence in matter of public concern.

The focus on *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs is thus on the 'genre' that is exclusively talk and adopts critical tone in discussing important socio-economic and political issues of the day, as opposed to other formats where talk exists peripherally or even interrupted by entertainment such music (Bosch, 2011b: 197). The key distinguishing factor therefore is the ability of the programmes to provide the space for audience to contribute in public discourse through the medium of talk in a meaningful way. As a result, the study contextualises 'participation' in the mediated public sphere context as the citizen's ability to call-in, text the radio show and speak in his or her own voice thereby "simultaneously constructing and expressing one's cultural identity" through the radio show (Fraser, 1990: 69). The programmes came into existence following the merger of the now-defunct *Radio Mmabatho*, the former Bophuthatswana Homeland

public service radio station and the Apartheid SABC Setswana Stereo in 1998 to form *Motsweding* FM. The programmes aim to offer citizens a comprehensive background information regarding existing socio-economic and political events. News and current affairs embrace political talk and discussion that focuses on current political event, in which citizens are invited to participate (Aalberg, van Aelst and Curran 2012: 37).

Stake (1995: 13) contends that “it is not unusual for the choice of case to be no ‘choice’ at all”. This argument implies that whatever choice of a case a researcher makes; it has to be motivated. In this study, an instrumental case is used to accomplish something other than understanding a particular situation. It provides insight into an issue or helps to refine a theory. The case is of secondary interest; it plays a supportive role, facilitating our understanding of something else. The case is often looked at in depth, its contexts scrutinized, its ordinary activities detailed, and because it helps the researcher pursue the external interest. The case may or may not be seen as typical of other cases (Stake, 1995: 13). Thus, an instrumental case study becomes relevant in studying *Motsweding* FM because the two programmes studied are embedded within the main case study which is *Motsweding* FM. The station is thus an instrument to understand the relationship between indigenous public service radio broadcasting, democratic democracy and citizenship in the context of South Africa using *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes as a platform towards this understanding.

4.4 Study Population and Sampling Techniques

Population is a “group or class of subjects, variables, concepts, or phenomena” (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011: 87). Thus, the population of the study consisted of *Motsweding* FM listenership between the age of 20-60 and above residing in the *Ngaka Modiri Molema*

District Municipality. This age group is likely to be conscientious socially and politically of their environment. The population also included *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs producers and presenters at SABC North West Provincial offices, as well as *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele news and current affairs* programmes' episodes. In certain instances, a group or class of subjects, variables, concepts, or phenomena are studied/ investigated. However, in most cases, it becomes a daunting task to examine group or class of subjects, variables, concepts, or phenomena due to time and resource constraints. Thus, Wimmer and Dominick (2011: 87) contend that "studying every member of a population is usually cost-prohibitive and may confound the research because measurements of large numbers of people often affect measurement quality". Therefore, it is essential for the researcher to sample the study population. A sample "is a subset of the population that is representative of the entire population" (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011:87).

Given the mixed method nature of the project, this study adopted purposive sampling and stratified sampling techniques. Purposive sampling technique is suitable in choosing cases that are particularly informative (Neuman, 1997: 206) and stratified sampling techniques, the technique that "ensures that a sample is drawn from a homogeneous subset of the population- that is, from the population that has similar characteristics" was chosen (Wimmer and Dominick, 2003: 92). Babbie (1995: 227) describes a purposive sample as "a type of nonprobability sampling method in which the researcher uses his/ her own judgment in the selection of sample members". Purposive sampling assisted the researcher to select *Motsweding FM* news and current affairs producers and presenters based on their knowledge of news production criteria. Patton (1990: 169) contends that it is important to select "information-rich cases for an in depth study. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the

purpose of the research". The study's choice of the producers and presenters was informed by the view that they possess critical journalistic skills and knowledge necessary in the production of news and current affairs pertinent to the study. The researcher also selected twenty-four (24) episodes from *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs (*Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele*) archives aired between July 2018-September 2018, twelve (12) from each programme that focuses on the presenter, the guest/expert and the audience as the active participants in the process of public debate during the shows.

The selected episodes focused on both local and national socio-economic and political issues of the day. Central to the idea of 'empowerment' is democratic participation in which citizens' acquire knowledge within the social, economic, and political contexts of their lives, in order to improve the quality of their life (Rappaport, 1987). The reason for obtaining only twenty-four (24), according to personnel in the archives section of *Motsweding* FM was that, it would be time consuming to package almost hundred and twenty (120) episodes, sixty from each programme aired over three months. On the other hand, stratified probability sampling technique was used to adequately get a representation of sample of *Motsweding* FM *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs listeners. Techniques to guarantee this "comprise randomisation, blinding, highly structured protocols, and written administered questionnaires with a limited range of predetermined responses. Sample sizes in quantitative approach are much larger than those used in qualitative research so that statistical methods to ensure that samples are representative" can be used (Sale, Lohfeld, and Brazil, 2002: 45). The researcher thus sampled about 200 participants (*Motsweding* FM listeners) both male and female from the age of 20-60 residing in the *Ngaka Modiri Molema* District Municipality. The researcher, therefore randomly selected the sample Fifty of *Motsweding* FM listeners

from the form each of the five Local Municipalities constituting *Ngaka Modiri Molema* District Municipality namely: Ditsobotla Mahikeng, Ramotshere Moiloa, Ratlou and Tswaing Local Municipalities. The participants were surveyed to get their perception concerning citizen democratic participation on *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes. At least, out of 200 questionnaire distributed, hundred and thirty-nine (139) were returned for analysis.

4.5 Data Collection Methods

Methods are “the techniques or procedures used to gather and collect data related to some research question or hypothesis” (Crotty, 2003: 3). A hallmark of case study research is the use of multiple data sources, a strategy which also augments data credibility (Patton, 1990; Yin, 2003). Both Patton (1990) and Yin (2003) state that potential data sources in qualitative study may include, but are not limited to: documentation, archival records, interviews, physical artefacts, direct observations, and participant-observation. In case study, data from these multiple sources are then converged in the analysis process rather than handled individually. The researcher used face-to-faced interview (**Appendix C**) to gather data from *Motsweding* FM Senior Current Affairs Producer and the Producer of *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes Boitumelo Korogo. Tom Lindlof and Bryan Taylor (2002) define qualitative interviews as events in which one person encourages the other to freely articulate their interests and experiences. They state that, so important has the interview techniques become that they are used in almost qualitative research. The second phase which was turned into an e-mailed interview was conducted with Refiloe Seboko (**Appendix L**), *Boresetse* news and current affairs presenter in December 2019. An emailed interview became the last option to gain information from the presenter as she often cited the time

pressure and deadlines to grant face-to-face interview. The questionnaire was emailed and returned by the respondent after being filled. The choice of the interview timing was based on the researcher and respondents' availability and convenience. Both face-to-face and emailed interview with the Senior Current Affairs producer and presenter allowed the researcher to understand the meanings they hold for their everyday activities in the production of news and current affairs (Marshal and Rossman, 1995: 81).

The interview, in particular face-to-face interview, provided the researcher with the opportunity to probe the interviewee further, for more information and clarity on responses provided. The face to face interview allows the researcher to ask key respondent about their views on audience democratic participation and the programmes structure as well as their opinions about events or issues covered in their programmes. The contents of the interview intended to understand the decision making process in news and current affairs production and presentation and the extent to which the structure of the programmes encourage and discourage public participation. The main advantage of the interview is "the wealth of detail that it provides" and its disadvantage is being "sensitive to interviewer bias" (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011: 139). Despite its disadvantages, the interview is a "means of knowledge construction between the researcher and the interviewee" (Mills, Bonner and Francis, 2006).

The producer of *Boresetse* (**Appendix I**), and the presenter of *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs (**Appendix F**) also opted for e-mail interview. They cited similar reasons, stated above by *Boresetse* news and current affairs presenter and agreed to email the feedback. They, irrespective of the effort and considerable amount of time pursuing/reminding them with calls, had not responded at the time of submitting this

project. In addition to interview, the archival records of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes were obtained from *Motsweding* FM archives. The archives were provided in digital audio content. The recorded episodes were also used to gain insight of the actual citizens'/audience participation on the programmes, between the presenters and the quest/expert as well as the presenters and the callers. The recorded data was later transcribed. In addition to the interview, the researcher listened to the contents of the selected current affairs programmes synopsis which were then transcribed and translated from Setswana to English. Quantitatively, in order to gather data about audience (citizens) views towards *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* current affairs, a survey was conducted. Check and Schutt (2012: 160) define survey research as "the collection of information from a sample of individuals through their responses to questions". The survey therefore asked participants about their perceptions and opinions towards *Motsweding* FM News and Current Affairs programmes contents and whether or not they feel empowered. The researcher also surveyed the three months' episodes' of both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs aired over a period of three months, that is July, August and September 2018.

4.5.1 Tools for Data Collection

An interview involves asking open-ended questions and follow-up probes designed to obtain an in-depth understanding of participants' experiences, perceptions, opinions, feelings, and knowledge (Patton, 2002). Interviewing is a useful method for investigating emerging topics, as it allows researchers to modify questions based on the answers from participants (deMarrais, 2004). This allowance for modification provides the researcher with an opportunity to deeper explore new ideas and concepts that emerge during the interview (Wood, Daley-Moore and Powell, 2019: 2442). The researcher used the voice

recorder in conducting face-to-face interviews with *Motsweding FM's* news and current affairs Senior Producer and Producer of *Tsele Le Tsele* to gain insight into the extent to which the station encourages citizen participation. Utilizing recordings allowed the researcher to concentrate solely on the interview and not be burdened with also taking notes. It allowed the researcher to be present and not be distracted with documentation. This strengthens the descriptive validity as the recording indicates features such as the tone of voice, possible pauses in statements, and so forth, that may be omitted from the transcript (Fitzpatrick, 2019). Moreover, a survey containing questionnaires for data collection was employed (**Appendix N**). Survey research provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population, using questionnaires or structured interviews for data collection with the intent of generalising from a sample to a population (Cresswell, 2003: 14; Yin, 2009: 13).

Babbie (1990:377) defines a questionnaire as a document containing questions and other types of items designed to solicit information appropriate to analysis. The questionnaire was distributed to participants to gather data pertaining to audiences' attitudes, opinions and perception concerning citizen participation and empowerment on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes. The questionnaire was collected upon being completed from the participants. Questionnaires may be self-administered or administered by a professional, may be administered individually or in a group, and typically include a series of items reflecting the research aims. Questionnaires may include demographic questions in addition to valid and reliable research instruments. The main disadvantage of quantitative surveys can be challenging or impossible to complete for people with a lower reading and literacy levels (George, Kruger and Tennant, 2012).

4.6 Thematic Content Data Analysis and Presentation

Neuman (1997: 272–273) lists content analysis as a key non-reactive research methodology (i.e. non-intrusive) and describes it as: “A technique for gathering and analysing the content of text. The ‘content’ refers to words, meanings, pictures, symbols, ideas, themes, or any message that can be communicated. The ‘text’ is anything written, visual, or spoken that serves as a medium for communication”. This research undertook content analysis which is used to study a broad range of ‘texts’ from transcripts of interviews with *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs presenter and producer as well as the discussions between the presenter and the guest/expert and the audience. Data analysis in a case study includes identification of patterns, i.e., the data and their interpretation are scrutinized for underlying themes and other patterns that characterize the case more broadly than a single piece of information can reveal” (Leedy and Ormrod, 2013: 141-142). Braun and Clarke (2006) as well as King (2004) argue that thematic analysis is a valuable method for investigating the perspectives of diverse research participants, stressing similarities and differences, and generating unanticipated insights. The aim is to bring together components or fragments of ideas or experiences, which often are meaningless when viewed alone (Leininger, 1985: 60).

Berelson (1952) suggests five main purposes of content analysis as follows: to describe substance characteristics of message content; to describe form characteristics of message content; to make inferences to producers of content; to make inferences to audiences of content; and to predict the effects of content on audiences. The study also used quantitative content analysis because some data was collected through archives and required categorisation. As Roberts (1997: 283) state, ‘quantitative content analysis is good for drawing inferences about contextual text based variables. In examining the

extent to which *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes facilitate the democratic debate on matters of general concern, the survey questionnaire and recorded episodes in which phone ins and Facebook messages manifest as well as interviews with the news and current affairs executive producer and the presenter of *Boresetse* news and current affairs were organised into themes. The themes identified included political, economic and social events that took place during the period of the study. Quantitatively, descriptive statistics were used to analyse data. Descriptive Statistics deals with the presentation of numerical facts, or data, in either tables or graph form. The researcher used tables to analyse and summarize data in a meaningful. Wimmer and Dominick (2003: 242) also explain that during a research study, investigators typically collect data that are measurements or observations of the people or items in the sample. These data usually have little meaning or usefulness until they are displayed or summarised using one of the techniques of descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics allow researcher to take random data and organise them into some type of order. Statistics is thus concerned with the scientific method by which information is collected, organised, analysed and interpreted for the purpose of description and decision making.

4.7 Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are conceptualized as “trustworthiness, rigor and quality in qualitative paradigm” (Golafshani, 2003: 604). To ensure the reliability and validity of data as well as to eliminate bias and increase the researcher’s truthfulness (Denzin, 1978), the researcher used triangulation. Triangulation is typically perceived to be a strategy for improving the validity of research or evaluation findings: “...triangulation is supposed to support a finding by showing that independent measures of it agree with it or, at least,

don't contradict it" (Miles and Huberman, 1984: 235). Creswell and Miller (2000: 126) view triangulation as a validity procedure where researchers search for convergence among multiple and different sources of information to form themes or categories in a study. The result from either qualitative or quantitative data can help advance or enrich the other method (Greene, Caracelli and Graham, 1989). Morse (1991) notes that a primarily qualitative design could embed some quantitative data to enrich the description of the sample participants. The researcher collected both forms of data independently and integrated the data in the analysis and interpretation by comparing the two databases to determine if there is convergence, differences, or some combinations (Creswell, 2009: 213). In other words, triangulation looks at the same phenomenon, or research question, from more than one source of data (Decrop, 1999:158). The researcher thus triangulated data coming from different sources to corroborate, elaborate or illuminate the research problem. This helped to limit personal and methodological biases and enhances a study's generalizability. Although the study relies extensively on the qualitative content analysis approach, triangulation method draws on quantitative selection of the news and current affairs episodes collected in the course of data collection.

4.8 Ethical Consideration

Researchers conduct qualitative research when they want to empower individuals to share their stories, amplify voices that have not been heard, and minimise the power relationships that naturally exist between a researcher and the participants in a study (Creswell, 2007). In qualitative research, how the interviewer makes decisions about collecting data can often lead to potential ethical dilemmas manifesting within the encounter with participants. In order to mitigate the ethical issues arising from rapport-building between *Motsweding FM's Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current

affairs producers and presenters respectively, the researcher became transparent about the research process and the aim of conducting the study (Kirsch, 1999). Another consideration is that the information must be provided “in such a way that participants’ knowledge is enhanced and the participants have senses of contribution to knowledge” (CPA, 1991: 47). Noting that most ethical guidelines for research involve human subjects, the researchers require that anonymity and/or confidentiality be guaranteed, informed consent is ensured, dignity is maintained and the individual and society receive more benefits than harm from the research (Couchman and Dawson, 1990). The researcher, in pursuit of compliance with informed consent, wrote the letter explaining the purpose of the study in seeking consent from *Motsweding* FM’s audience to participate by following the North-West University (Mahikeng Campus) ethical procedure. Informed consent places an obligation on the researchers to provide “prospective subjects or authorized third parties, full and frank disclosure of all information relevant to free and informed consent” and applying the “language that is reasonably understandable to research participants” (Smythe and Murray, 2000: 316).

Informed consent is the right of every individual when participating in a research (Couchman and Dawson, 1990). In this regard, the letter explained the purpose and significance of the study to the respondents objectively. The justification for any dishonesty should be expounded to participants as early as possible, “normally during debriefing immediately following participation” (Smythe and Murray, 2000: 316). As a result, methods of deception and coercion were avoided to make sure that respondents were treated with respect. Wimmer and Dominick (2003: 71), view deception as “deliberately providing false information”. The researcher did not distort or manipulate information to serve his interest or coerce participants to provide information unwillingly.

4.9 Summary

This chapter presented research methodology and design used to investigate the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest of democratic participation. Mixed methods research, i.e., a research method in which the investigator collects, analyses, mixes, and draws inferences from both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or a program of inquiry provided a better understanding of research problems that either approach alone. This research approach provided the researcher with the freedom to collect, analyses, mix, and draw inferences from both quantitative and qualitative methods. In this way, the researcher was free to choose the methods, techniques, and procedures of research that best meet the needs and purposes of this study. The next chapters' analyses and interprets data in determining the extent to which *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs form the public sphere in which citizens participate in mediated democratic public discourse concerning important general issues of common concern. These issues are categorised into socio-economic and political themes of local and national of general concern. The analyses, interpretation and discussion of data in the next two chapters are centred on the three main research questions framing the study.

CHAPTER FIVE:

***BORESETSE AND TSELE LE TSELE* NEWS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS PROGRAMMES AND THE FORMATION OF MEDIATED DEMOCRATIC PUBLIC DISCOURSE**

5.1 Introduction

This chapter mainly focuses on the analyses of the structure and strategies employed by *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in encouraging participation. The chapter further looks at the analysis and interpretation of the guest or expert interviewed, vox pops, referring to interviews with ordinary man and woman on the street, emailed interviews responses of *Boresetse* news and current affairs presenter, as well as qualitative interview with *Motsweding* FM Senior News and Current Affairs producer and producer of *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The presenters' role in setting the agenda for public discussion in both programmes was scrutinised. The audience also plays a central role in talk or discussion programmes, as a result, audience phone-ins and social media text such Facebook messages read by presenters during the show are also be scrutinised in establishing their meaning.

5.2 The Structure and Agenda Setting Strategy of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* News and Current Affairs

Motsweding FM news and current affairs programmes are aired for one hour each, i.e., *Boresetse* 06:00-07: 00 am and *Tsele Le Tsele* 06:00-07: 00 pm Monday to Friday weekly. This hour per programme is preceded by the presentation of news bulletin which normally last for three to five minutes. It is further segmented into highlights of news ranging from socio-cultural, economic and political events of the day, both national and

international. This last for twenty to twenty-five minutes including commercial adverts given that *Motsweding* FM like the SABC as a whole is predominantly funded through commercial means. The discussion segment normally ranges from twenty to thirty minutes. This depends on day to day production of news and current affairs. Equally *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs attempt to create the public sphere by allowing ordinary members of the society to contribute to the democratic debate on local and national socio-economic and political matters of common concern. They have adopted the same strategy of making citizens to feel free to express their views and opinions by being seen as *autonomous* facilitators of democratic participation *from the views expressed and ensuring* that the station conforms to broadcasting code of conduct.

The strategy goes like this *in Setswana version*: “*Maikutlo le ditshwaelo tse ditlhagisiwang fa ga se tsa S.A.B.C kana Motsweding FM, ditshwaelo le maikutlo aa tlhagisiwa ke moreetse, ke a moreetsi ka nosi, mme S.A.B.C kana Motsweding FM re ka serwale maikarabelo ka maikutlo aa tlhagisiwang ke moreetsi*”. The English translated version goes on like this: *The views and the comments expressed in this programme, are not for S.A.B.C or Motsweding FM, the views and the comments expressed by the listener, are the listeners’ views. Therefore, S.A.B.C or Motsweding FM cannot take the responsibility of the comments expressed by the listener*”. Thus, Tuchman, (1972b) notes that these “routine practices represent a strategic ritual that helps protect against the risks of the trade such as libel suits and reprimands from superiors”. The presenters then remind the callers of the contact number 0898602233 and their Facebook accounts as follow *Dikgang@SABC* and *Dikgang@MotswedingFM*. Both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs production teams hold a meeting to decide on the sequence of the news items to be presented and which item is the most important for news story of

day. This means that “news making is a consensual process. The forming of consensus takes place within a context of shared values-conventions about news as well as conception of the newsman’s role” (Reese, 1990: 393). The production of *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes through the process of realization of rational-critical deliberation exemplify everyday activity, and thus the deliberative public sphere norm is endless and conjoined to societal being (Dahlberg, 2013). The discussion on both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes begin by providing the background and introduction to the topic, and the guest/expert and then followed by the presenter-guest/expert interview which lasts for approximately ten to fifty minutes before audience are given a platform to contribute to the discussion. The study of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* News and Current Affairs revealed that the station set agenda for socio-economic and political issues for public discussion. This was confirmed in separate interviews with **Boitumelo Korogo**, *Motsweding* FM News and Current Affairs Executive Producer. He also produces *Tsele Le Tsele* News and Current Affairs. **Refiloe Seboko**, *Boresetse* news and current affairs presenter also agrees with the former in an interview excerpts below. The researcher explored the producer and presenter’s view on the programmes structure in its contribution toward citizen’s democratic participation.

Boitumelo Korogo, Producer: *“It’s always us setting the agenda by bringing people or gives them topic to discuss and debate” (Appendix C).*

Refiloe Seboko, Presenter: *“citizens are allowed space to make their comments as long as they stick to what the topic of the day is” (Appendix L).*

The views expressed by both the producer and the presenter in the above excerpt can be linked with the argument that the public sphere conception’s status as radically

democratic does not fully account for power and the democratic role of the politics associated with voices excluded from deliberations (Dahlberg, 2013: 1). In other words, the structure with reference the *Broadcasting Act No; 4 of 1999* both enables and constrains *Motsweding FM* journalistic activity agency (Yuan and Thomas, 2011: 182). Discussions of participation on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* programmes tend to be framed along an axis of freedom versus constraint. Ideals of democratic participation suggest that citizens' empowerment is more real when non-participants have ample room to state their case than when format constraints are tight (Ytreberg, 2004: 689).

In order to be considered legitimate deliberators and citizens, Dahlberg (2007: 131) notes that "subjects must come to internalize the rules of the deliberative form of communication deemed democratically valid or be excluded from the public sphere. As a result, participants whose 'naturalized' modes of communication are closer to what is deemed valid will be advantaged over others. That is, in order to be equally included, some participants must be more disciplined than others into fitting the idealized deliberative mode; disciplining that involves the exclusion (or repression) of those 'voices' deemed illegitimate because they are interpreted as failing to meet the conditions set for good argument" (irrational, non-democratic, private) (Dahlberg 2007: 131). McChesney (1998: 8) contends that an informed and participating citizenry is made possible through "the provision of analysis by a healthy and vibrant media system". The public sphere is subsequently essential to modern democratic politics. For democratic politics to work on *Motsweding FM*, news and current affairs programmes *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* citizens must be able to communicate matters of common concerns with one another, and have access to the same forums of political debate (Addis, 2007: 134). The views expressed by both the producer and the presenter in the above excerpt became evident

on *Tsele Le Tsele* episode aired on the 11th of September 2018 in which crime statistics in South Africa became an area of focus. The presenter, Thabiso Moss begin the show with a broad question relating to crime and remind the listeners to remain focus on the topic.

Thabiso Moss: *Ke eng se se dirang gore dipalo tsa bosinyi di o ketsege le gore tharabololo e ka nna eng? Fa o ka a raba ka mokgwa oo re go bo tsang ka one gore Ke eng se se dirang gore dipalo tsa bosinyi di o ketsege le gore tharabololo e ka nna eng? (Setswana, 11th of September 2018).*

Thabiso Moss: *What contribute to high level of crime, what could be the solution? If you could answer as we ask you that what contribute to high level of crime, what could be the solution? (English translation, 11th of September 2018).*

The manner in which the question is posed clearly confirms the agenda setting role of *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs. The show is structured in such a way that audience participation follows the narrative of the station. The leading story of the day broadcasted on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs often acts as catalyst for public debate in citizens' political life. The news media are a major source of "the pictures in public's minds about the larger world of public affairs, a world that for most citizens is out of reach, out of sight and out of mind" (Lippmann, 1992). Murdock (1982:118) concurs as he states that "by providing accounts of the contemporary world and images of the 'good life', they play a pivotal role in shaping social consciousness". The public broadcaster does not only help citizens to know about the world, but it also makes sense of it. In other words, the public broadcaster plays "pivotal role in organizing the images and discourses through which people make sense" of the world (Murdock and Golding, 2005: 60). The media, by implication the public broadcaster, by selecting stories "structure our understanding by actively ruling in and ruling out certain realities, offering

the maps and codes which mark out territories and assign problematic events and relations to explanatory contexts” (Hall, 1977:341). Media agenda setting theory posits a relationship between the relative importance given by the public broadcaster “to various topics and the degree of salience these topics have for the general public” (Ader, 1995: 300). In carrying out audience, survey the researcher tried to find out the audience’s view on the structure of citizen participation on *Motsweding* FM’s News and Current Affairs programmes. The following table as derived from data generated from the audience survey, reflects respondents’ view of the forms of participation on *Motsweding* FM’s News and Current Affairs programmes.

Table 1: Respondents’ view of the forms of participation on *Motsweding* FM’s News and Current Affairs programmes

Responses	Frequency	Percent
open participation	84	63.6
managed participation	36	27.3
framed participation	12	9.1
Total	132	100.0

The table (Table1) provides the descriptive statistics of the respondents’ view of the forms of participation on *Motsweding* FM’s News and Current Affairs programs. The findings indicate that 63.6% hold the view that participation is open, while 27.3% of participants indicate that participation is managed and 9.1% believe that participation is framed. The researcher argues that by setting the agenda for public participation the station limits citizens’ rights to exercise their freedom of expression in what most talk radio stations call an open line debate where citizens as audience set the agenda. The agenda is set in the

sense that audience are allowed to talk about whatever issues general concern they deem important for public attention, in most cases, as reported by the news media. Moeller and de Vreese (2015:2) also note that the news media is likely to trigger conversational subject. They state, “while talking about politics, citizens often exchange information they learned from the news media”. Anderson, Dardenne and Killenberg (1994: 37) also concur with the latter as they argue, news is what people talk about, and news makes people talk. Gamson states that citizens’ talk is enthused by the mass media. He stresses that “the conversations overwhelmingly began with media discourse” and notes that media interactions are “materials for conversation”. He further reiterates that the media is an important “conversational resources” (Gamson, 1992: 117: 131).

5.3 Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele News and Current Affairs and The Limits of Debate

Gutmann and Thompson (2004: 9) suggest that ‘inclusion’ is the main condition of the extent to which deliberation [participation] is democratic. The principle of inclusivity in democratic participation theory embraces the multiplicity and diversity of citizen voices (Smith and Wales, 2000: 53). **Boitumelo Korogo**, *Motsweding FM* News and Current Affairs Executive Producer and producer of *Tsele Le Tsele* News and Current Affairs, explained in an interview that according to the clock format, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs have a twenty minutes’ slot whereby newsmakers are invited. He states that “It could be from government, it could be politicians, or it could be ordinary people with different expertise to discuss different issues” (**Korogo excerpt interview, Appendix C**). However, in all the episodes surveyed over the period of the study, the researcher discovered that most of the guests and or experts (people who possess knowledge in certain disciplines) were elites (those who hold powerful position in society).

This is evident in the following episodes; on the 02 July 2018, *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs in which Mr Sello Kau, an expert in economy from the Agricultural Research Council of South Africa was invited in the discussion pertaining to how petrol hike is likely to affect the agricultural sector and consumers in general. The same programme invited Advocate Neo Sephuthi, a gender activist, to talk about Gender-Based-Violence with the focus on the South African Universities rape culture on the 16th of August 2018. *Boresetse* news and current affairs invited Mamokgethi Molopyane, mining and labour analyst, on the 01st of August 2018 to discuss the implications of unemployment rate following the release of South Africa's unemployment rate Statistics. On the 26th of September 2018, the same invited Mr Kgame Molope, Lecturer in Political Studies and International Relations from North-West University to discuss the late and former President Nelson Mandela's legacy in international affairs.

The elite's concentration on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes constitutes lack of plurality and diversity of divergent views on public issues in the public sphere. In this way, the public broadcaster, as cultural forum, play a role in re-producing and controlling knowledge and thus, it can be seen as being among the "more crucial realms over which social classes must now compete for control" (Kahan, 1999: 25). Taking into cognisance this perspective, if citizens are represented in radio broadcast public debate in their indigenous languages, they can be able "to reflect their agenda of identity re-establishment towards empowerment through the active participation in the production of media contents" (Dahal and Aram, 2013:1). It is through such a dynamic element that public broadcasting can serve as a significant cultural forum and a factor in democratisation process (Newcomb and Hirsch, 1983:45-55). Reflecting on deliberative democracy and the public sphere models Karppinen (2007: 495) notes

that the models have been extensively criticised for “overemphasising rational consensus and overlooking the irreducible value of pluralism” in modern democratic societies. Thus, undermine politics of difference and the complexity of ways in which the programmes can meaningfully contribute to democratic debate. According to this view, *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes as access and participation programmes should, be evaluated in terms of “how well they express a diversity of public voices and challenge established power to recognise the complexities of everyday life” (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994:35). The programmes given sustained critiques of the deliberative and public sphere models’ conception fail to account fully for power and exclusion and thus support status quo social and political systems (Dahlberg 2007: 128).

The failure to invite guests from different ideological positions as well as ordinary members of society affected by news item as found in both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs episodes’ limit mediated public debate. The debate is limited to elite’s perspectives, it restricts and suppress the spectrum of voices available in society. The underlying assumption in this assertion is that by inviting only the powerful people and representative from powerful institutions, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes generally reflect established interests and thus produce ideological visions consistent with the nation and the world (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000: 169). That contributes in the widening of the existing gulf of inequality in public voice due to inequality among citizens in terms of “social power” or “the possibilities an actor has in social relationships to assert his own will and interest” (Habermas, 1996: 175). Critics of deliberative democracy argue that the voices that can speak in the public sphere replicate existing social and economic hierarchies (Jacobs et al., 2009; Schlozman, Verba, and Brady, 2012).

Undeniably, Zaller (1992) argues that public opinion is largely a product of elite cues as they are transmitted by the news media. If this is the case, it stands to reason that leaders who engage in more thoughtful rhetoric may prime citizens to adopt a more deliberative posture (Wessler, 2008). The apparent failure of *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs programmes, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* to be radically democratic enough is inherent in Habermasian public sphere conception's scathing critique, voiced particularly strongly by 'poststructuralist-influenced critics', that is it fails to fully account for exclusion of diverse voices in communicative space (Dalhberg, 2013: 1). For example, Mouffe (1999: 757) points out that a conception of the public sphere must take into account the "multiplicity of voices that a pluralist society encompasses", as well as "the complexity of the power structure that this network of differences implies". In other words, mediated public debate should provide a "robust, uninhibited, and wide-open market place of ideas, in which opposing views may meet, contend, and take each other's measure" (Gurevitch and Blumler, 1990: 25), as opposed to focusing only on elites.

Motsweding FM news and current affairs programmes can make a substantial impact to democratic public life by including ideas that are outside the boundaries of established consensus with a focus on diversity that welcomes disagreement and dissenting views (Croteau and Hoynes, 2006: 32). Most scholars agree that participation in public deliberation about issues of common concern make citizens reflect on competing interests and values and accord responsibility not only for themselves, but also for the well-being of others (Pateman, 1970; MacPherson, 1977). Moreover, by allowing citizens to critically engage with ideas and construct arguments, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs' as mediated public deliberation can become a rich form of political information (Jackson, Scullion and Molesworth, 2013: 206). For example, Page

(1996: 1) credits public deliberation with “ensuring that the public’s policy preferences—upon which democratic decisions are based—are informed, enlightened, and authentic”. More importantly, however, the kind of deliberativeness that citizens observe in the mass media can also help to model deliberative behaviour in everyday life (Wessler, 2008). Through its form, *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes carry debate that are essential for reflective opinions on public matters of general concern from socio-economic and political spheres.

5.4 The Guest/Expert’s Contribution in the Public Sphere

Motsweding FM news and current affair programmes can be recognized as avenue for the “preservation of citizens’ right to be informed” (Melody, 1990: 18). This is seen in terms of the guest and/or expert invited to unpack issues under discussion. The guest and/or expert role is often to clarify questions and contentious issues raised by audience. They are invited depending on the chosen topic of the day. They could be social, economic and political analysts. The guest in most episodes surveyed come from either local, provincial and national government. The role played by the guest and/or expert often educative as it enables the marginalized citizens to have influence in decisions making that affect their lives and others and gaining recognition as having a right to engage in the democratic process (Eyben, Kabeer and Cornwall, 2008: 14).

The following excerpt from *Boresetse* news and current affairs episodes aired on the 26th of September 2018 demonstrate role play by the guest and or expert on *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs platform.

Kgame Molope (Guest): *“Mme tla ke go latlhelle ntlha e ngwe ya botlhokwa. Foreign policy ga se sengwe se se tlhalogangwang bonolo ka ntlha ya gore maikaelelo a yona ga se ao a bonwang fa. Ke a jaanong le a pakatelele. Ke ka moo foreign policy e tshwanetseng go lejwa jaaka peeletso ya paka telele mo dinageng tse dingwe”.* (Setswana 26th of September 2018)

Kgame Molope (Guest): *“Let me also state this important fact. Foreign policy is not something that is easily understood because its goal is not immediate. It’s a long term goal. That’s why foreign policy should be look at as a long term investment in other countries”.* (English translation, 26th of September 2018)

Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele news and current affairs guests and/or experts attempt to direct audience participation by assisting to evaluate and critique the rules of engagement and the actions of both political and other relevant institutions and their actors (Gerodimos et al. 2013: 4). The discussion took place amidst the Nelson Mandela Peace Summit whereby senior government officials and representatives of international organizations called on world leaders to uphold the principles Mr. Mandela stood for— courage, humility and tolerance—to promote peace and stability across the globe. Such information exchange is said to benefit participants in the reconsideration and refinement of their values and interests (Bachrach and Botwinick, 1992). The educative characteristic of radio broadcasting in quest of democratic participation guarantees that, citizens become more engaged and active in public affairs; acceptance for opposing point of views will be appreciated, improves citizens’ understanding of their own preferences and their ability to justify those preferences with well-informed arguments (Mendelberg, 2002: 153). The primary functions of public broadcaster in a democratic society is “to inform its citizens, and empower” them to engage in political discussions and increase their knowledge on national issues such as politics (Dimitrova, Shehata, Strömbäck, and Nord, 2014: 98).

5.5 Impromptu Interview and The Limits of Debate

The impromptu interview with the ordinary (wo)man on the street creates the involvement of the audience with news item, as audience members can identify with these ordinary persons. The inclusion of impromptu interview can be seen as a form of democratisation of the public sphere in which eye witnesses' lived experience are represented (Becker, 2017). To prompt participation, both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs use the voice of ordinary (wo)man on the street to share their lived experienced as a way of making listeners understand and appreciate the topic. The university student rape culture took a centre stage in the South African public domain in 2018. The excerpts of *Tsele Le Tsele* on the 14th of August 2018 below demonstrate the extent to which eye witness contribute to the credibility of the news item and thus enhance public participation.

Student 1: *"You wouldn't get anything you want unless you do something wrong...unless you sleep with someone".*

Student 2: *We have to sleep with people of higher power to get like basic thing that we need like for example accommodation. You can't go to the library".*

The use of ordinary people's voice who might have directly or indirectly been affected by the news item is useful for the cultivation of productive discourse as they bring credibility to the story in the deliberative public sphere which might otherwise be absent in straight forward news reporting. This suggests that *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs production team select "opportune witnesses" for interviews and quotes (Hagen, 1993).

5.6 Summary

This chapter mainly focused on the analyses of the structure and strategies employed by *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in encouraging participation. The chapter further looks at the analysis and interpretation of the guest or

expert interviewed, vox pops (interviews with ordinary man and woman on the street), emailed interviews responses of *Boresetse* news and current affairs presenter, as well as qualitative interview with *Motsweding* FM Senior News and Current Affairs producer and producer of *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The presenters' role in setting the agenda for public discussion in both programmes was scrutinised. The audience also play a central role in talk or discussion programmes, as a result, audience phone-ins and social media text such Facebook messages read by presenters during the show were also scrutinised. The next chapter analyses and interprets the themes identified in *Boresetse* and *Tsele le Tsele* news and current affairs. The themes are categorised into political and socio-economic issues evident within the contents of archival records of the selected episodes.

CHAPTER SIX:

MEDIATED DEMOCRATIC PUBLIC DISCOURSE, ACCOUNTABILITY, GOOD GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY

6.1 Introduction

This chapter mainly focuses on the analyses and interpretation of the themes identified in *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs episodes during the period under investigation. The themes range from socio-economic and political issues evident within the contents of archival recorded of the selected episodes in which the researcher explore the stated themes. This chapter aims to present and analyse data by examining the democratic quality of everyday communicative practices on *Motsweding* FM current affairs, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* through which the public sphere is constituted.

6.2 Political Discussion

The concept of a public sphere of informal citizen deliberation enabling the formation of rational public opinion that can critically guide political systems is seen by many democratic theorists as fundamental to strong democracy (Benhabib, 1996; Bohman, 1996; Dryzek, 2000; Young, 2000). The most important political issues that dominated both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs during the months of July, August and September 2018 centred around leadership tension among political parties, suspicions on new political parties' formation resulting from the recalling of Former President Jacob Zuma, corruption and accountability. The places where people talk politics are the public sphere. The public sphere, as Livingstone and Lunt (1994:16) argue, has a "potential influence over power by forming a critical consensus which produces a coherent public opinion and by making the state accountable to its citizens". The public sphere is...what one might call "the factory of politics—its site of

production...the space in which politics is first made possible at all and communicable” (Kluge, 1981–2:213). Dahlberg (2014: 10) explains that argumentation constituting the public sphere of citizen participation should be independent from the influence of state and corporate interests. He further reiterates that this condition does not mean that citizen’s democratic participation has no place in the affairs of the state and the economy. Citizen’s democratic participation is required for the effective functioning and legitimacy of democratic government (both executive and legislative branches) at all the levels (local, provincial and national) and for democratic relationships to develop for a well-functioning democratic society. The direction of “force and influence should be from the public sphere to these systems, and not the other way around. The means by which this influence can take place is rooted in citizens’ democratic participation in the affairs of the state and the economy. The formation of public opinion through which citizens are able to influence and hold accountable the government” at local, provincial and national levels contributes to the public sphere (Dahlberg, 2014: 10). In a politically charged environment characterised by public cynicism concerning perceived political corruption, maladministration and political deployment incompetency, *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs discussion, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* represent a significant platform for public–politician interaction.

The following excerpts from *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs episode broadcasted on the 6th of July 2018 demonstrate mechanism for how the programme through citizens’ participation holds officials to account for how they exercise power. Aalberg, van Aelst and Curran (2012: 34) write that news and commentary should “enable citizens to make informed and effective choice about the exercise of state power”. This episode provided citizens an opportunity to express their opinion on how the state institutions exercise their

state power. **Refiloe Seboko**, Boresetse news and current affairs presenter, states that through town hall debate that Current Affairs have, SABC gives “the public an opportunity to debate with different stake-holders, which will be a discussion that seeks to give citizens opportunity to hold leaders accountable” (**Appendix L, E- Mail Interview**). In this episode, the guests were the Rustenburg Municipal Mayor Khunou and the Acting Spokesperson, Amos Moleele. The show host was Mr Boitumelo Korogo. The programme begins by the background reports to provide the listener as active and passive participants with the context to the topic. The reporter, **Mmmankau Mothoa**, provides the background:

Mmmankau Mothoa (Reporter): *“Toropopo ya Rustenburg Ke ngwe ya ditoropo di le some tharo goralala Afrika Borwa tse di tlhopilweng ke puso ya bosetshaba go tsenya tirisong ya porojeke ya dipalangwa tsa botlhe ee tokafaditsweng. Thulaganyo le leano la dipalagwa tsa botlhe lo rulagantswe ke lefapha la bosetshaba la dipalagwa le go amogelwa se mmuso ke kabinete digwaga di le lesome le bobedi tse difiteleng. Ka ngwaga wa dichelete wa 2011-2012 mmasepala wa Rustenburg o ne wa simolola porojeke ya go baakanya le go tlabolola ditsela tsa mo gare ga toropo le tse ditswang ka toropo e le go baakanyetsa mokgwa o o mosha wa dipalgwa tsa botlhe oo itsegeng jaaka Rustenburg Rapid Transport kgotsa RRT. Mokaedi wa namaosatshwere kwa lefapheng la dipalagwa wa mmasepala wa Rustenburg Obed Moleele ore fa lemorago la porojeke (Setswana except, 06/07/2018)*

Mmmankau Mothoa (Reporter): *Rustenburg is one of the thirteen towns in South Africa which were selected by national government to put into practice improved public Rapid Transport project. It has been commissioned by the National Department of Transport and officially welcome by cabinet twelve years ago. During 2011-2012 financial year Rustenburg local municipality embarked on the project to repair and improve Rustenburg Central Business roads and those exiting Central Business District as way to provide for a better public transport system for the people called of Rustenburg Rapid Transport or RRT. Obed Moleele, the Acting Member of Municipal Council for transport in Rustenburg Municipality provide the background: (English translated except, 06/07/2018).*

The episode is part of the station's outsidest broadcast program conducted occasionally throughout North West Province of South Africa's local municipalities to hold them to account. The broadcast took place amidst the allege poor municipal governance, corruption and reported financial irregularities which led to the collapse of many municipalities, contributing to ineffective and efficient service delivery to most communities in the province.

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Jaanong kgang e ga se ya rona. Ke ya lona baagi. Re batla go fa lona tshono. A re ye ko go lona. Re tle re tseye dipotso le ditshwaelo mo baaging,* (Setswana except, 06/07/2018).

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *"Now this issue is not ours. We would like to give you an opportunity. Let's turn to you. We will take your questions and comments"* (English translated except, 06/07/2018).

The above excerpt demonstrates the station's strategy to create a sense of belonging to the participants and make them feel included in the discussion. The principle of inclusion can be seen throughout Habermas's public sphere account. He states that "access to the public sphere is open in principle to all citizens" (Habermas, 1997: 105). The participant named Justice then expressed his frustration:

Justice (Participant): *"I am surprise gore in our meeting we have a PR councilor who is suspended to be also responding to these things. A atheka mmeyara in this meeting. She is part of the people who are failing us because she sits also ko council le ena".* (Setswana except, 06/07/2018).

Justice (Participant): *"I am surprise that in our meeting we have a PR councilor who is expected to be responding to these things. Attacking the major in this meeting. She is part of the people who fail us because she sits also in the council."* (English translated except, 06/07/2018).

The above excerpts demonstrate the power of the public sphere in which citizens are provided with space to hold the official to account. The phenomenon of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs affords a rather privileged position within current debates about the nature of a mediated public sphere offering a discursive space where ordinary citizens meet and interact with institutional representative in a public forum, the programmes discussion segment may be lauded for its democratic potential (Wood, 2014: 66). The participants in the above excerpt express general mistrust and lack of confidence in the political administration. The South African political public sphere prior to the 2019 general election was characterized by dissatisfaction with the political administration. As in the above extract, Refiloe Seboko states in an interview that “opening line for listeners to make comments gives the public a chance to engage on issues of national importance and raise their concerns about what is happening in their areas”. Habermas (1964:49) speaks of the political public sphere “when public discussion deals with objects connected to the activity of the state”. Central to the public sphere, as evident in the excerpt below, is “the necessity of discursive justification of democratic politics” (Benhabib, 1992:119). This could be seen as the presenter put pressure on the guest to answer previously asked questions.

Boitumelo Korogo (Presenter): *Rre Moleele ke go boditse kgantele gore mme yo o raisa kgang e ke eriisitseng ya gore lo epile toropo e yotlhe instead ya gore le epe side e one, lefetese...ke ne ke bua ka problem, gore selo a ga se problem gore lo kabo lo epile side e one, la fetsa, la yamo go e ngwe, la fetsa (Setswana except, 06/07/2018).*

Boitumelo Korogo (Presenter): *Mr Moleele, I have asked you earlier that...this woman raise the issue that I raised earlier that you dug the whole town instead of digging one side and finish...I was talking about the problem, is this not a problem that you should have dug one side and finish, then go on the other and finish (English translated except, 06/07/2018).*

Rre Molelee (Guest): *Go nnile botlhokwa thata gore re simolole ka constructions ya ditsela tse re itseng gore ke tsa bese mo selemong sele le sengwe gore re kgone go fetsa (Setswana except, 06/07/2018).*

Rre Molelee (Guest): *It has been very important for us to start with the construction of roads designed for buses at a time and finish (English translated except, 06/07/2018).*

The above episodes demonstrate the extent to which *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs provide a public sphere in which citizens may examine issues in a democratic forum in which those in power may be held accountable to the public. Theorists of deliberative democracy concur that decision makers should be held accountable for their decisions by the deliberative process. But, as Habermas (1992: 452) aptly formulates: “Discourses do not govern. They generate a communicative power that cannot take the place of administration but can only influence it. This influence is limited to the procurement and withdrawal of legitimation”. The episodes presented above exemplify the extent to which news and current affair on *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes attempt to bring communicative power to bear on ‘decision makers’ mainly by deliberating about their justifications. This occurs when programme presenter evaluates the reasons given “by decision makers for their decisions in the light of other reasons advanced for alternative positions either by other actors” (Wessler, 2008: 6).

The following episode of *Tsele Le Tsele* aired on the 19th of September 2018 exemplify the communicative power of citizens and the media in this instance *Motsweding* FM’s current affairs programmes’ ability to challenge decisions of the establish power. The episode’s theme was centered around the North West Provincial government’s decision to put several municipalities under administration as a result of collapse in service delivery. The affected municipalities were Ditsobotla, Ramotshere Moiloa, Kagisano Molopo and Mahikeng. Most of the administrators deployed in these municipalities were

previously deployed in other municipalities such as Rustenburg, Dr Ruth Segomotso Mompoti, Madibeng in the North-West Province and West Rand in Gauteng. The participants' views expressed in this episode manifested discontent with the officials' 'decision-making process and failure to consult them. The show host was Mr. Thabiso Moss, the regular presenter and the guest was the North West Provincial Government Spokesperson for Local Government and Traditional affairs Mr. Ben Bole.

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Go reng le dumela gore batla thusa dimmasepala tsena re lebeletse their track record? (Setswana except, 09/09/2018)*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Why do you think that they would be able to assist these municipalities when considering their track record? (English translated except, 09/09/2018)*

Through this critical supervision as highlighted in the except above, the public sphere transforms the nature of power and authority because it ruled out 'authority based on anything other than a good argument' (Bolton, 2005) as it continues in the except below:

Ben Bole (Guest): *Rona re le puso gare kitla re tseya batho ba eleng gore ga bana maitemogelo aa maleba. Re tsaya batho baba nang le maitemogelo aa maleba ka gonne baya ko dimmasepaleng go ya go thusa go support go chenjja selebego within a short space of time (Setswana except, 09/09/2018).*

Ben Bole (Guest): *We as government will never take people without relevant inexperience. We take people with relevant experience because they go to the municipalities to assist, to support and change the phase within the short space of time (English translated except, 09/09/2018).*

The public sphere as in the following excerpt episode of *Tsele Le Tsele* aired on the 19th of September 2018, based on dialogue and rationality, demonstrate the extent to

which it is “society’s defence against the illegitimate use of power as the state is held accountable through critical public scrutiny” (Mustapha, 2012b, 30)

Sebetlele (Participant): *Potso ya ka e one fela. Gore how can you take oo e leng gore ona le diphoso tse dintsi o be o ya go moetsa administrator. Mmereko wa mayora ke eng, why o satle mo go rona community wa re botsa gore re batla mang? (Setswana except, 19/09/2018).*

Sebetlele (Participant): *I have only one question, that’s how can you take someone with questionable character and make him an administrator. What is the work of the Major? Why can’t you involve us the community? (English translated except, 19/09/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Thabo Setlhogo kwa Switzreneke*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Thabo Setlhogo from Switzreneke*

Thabo Setlhogo (Participant): *So you ask yourself gore why the EXCO mo Bokone Bophirima, they took a decision of taking those people ba baisa ko mmasepaleng...there is a clear indication ya gore our EXCO mo Bokone Bophirima does not have interest ya go nnetefatsa gore dimmasepala tsa rona di nne stable, it does not have interest ya go netefatsa.... actually what they enjoy they enjoy looting ko dimmasepaleng (Setswana except, 19/09/2018).*

Thabo Setlhogo (Participant): *So you ask yourself why do the EXCO in North West took a decision of taking those people to municipalities...there is a clear indication that the EXCO in North-West does not have interest to ensure that our municipalities become stable, it does not have interest of ensuring...actually what they enjoy...they enjoy looting the municipalities (English translated except, 19/09/2018).*

In the above excerpt, the participants clearly show no confidence in the officials’ decision making process. The normative legitimacy of a democratic decision is contingent upon “the degree to which those affected by it, have been included in the decision-making process and have had the opportunity to influence the outcomes” (Young 2000: 5–6). The question posed by the caller named Sebetlele above questioned decision making

power in term of inclusion. In other words, the official's disregard of public participation is questioned in the public sphere. The following is an excerpt of the interview between the presenter and the guest from the episodes aired on September, 03, 2018 in which the political public sphere was enacted through the medium of talk. The debate in this episodes was inspired by the visit to in North West province by the newly formed political party the Mazibuye African Congress to introduce its leadership in Marikana near Rustenburg. The party was being viewed with suspicions by members of the public as being a pro-Zuma movement formed to contest the 2019 elections in South Africa. The party prioritises land redistribution and support radical economic transformation, holding Former President Jacob Zuma as their inspiration. The guest was Romeo Matjila, the party's Secretary General, and the presenter was Thabiso Moss. The presenter begins by asking the question:

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Ntle le lefatshe, ke dintlha dife dile pedi kgotsa di le tharo tse di botlhokwa thata mo Mazibuye African Congress. (Setswana except, 03/09/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Besides the land, what are some of the issues, two or three which are crucial to Mazibuye African Congress (English translated except, 03/09/2018).*

Romeo Matjila (Guest) (Secretary General): *...Ntho e re tsileng go berakana le yona from our cardinal pillars ke taba e ena ya unemployment, particularly when it come to the youth unemployment (Setswana except, 03/09/2018).*

Romeo Matjila (Guest): (Secretary General): *What we are going to focus on from our cardinal pillars is the issue of unemployment, particularly when it come to the youth unemployment (English translated except, 03/09/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Joel Rooderpoort*

Joel (Caller 2): *Rraetsho nna ke ne kere ke mogakolole fela gore re sa ntsane, rona mo North West, re na le issues tsa rona. Go ne go sa tlhokagale gore battle go confuse batho mo North-West. Ntate re siame ko NW ntate...Re tla dirisa...Ga ke bone gore ba ya kae (Setswana except, 03/09/2018).*

Joel (Caller 2): *Sir I wanted to remind him that here in North-West, we still have our own issue. It was not necessary to come to confuse the people of North-West. Sir we are well in North- west...we will use...I don't see where they are going (English translated except, 03/09/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): Rre Mokgatle Dryhard

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): Mr. Mokgatle Dryhard

Rre Mokgatle (Caller 3): *Rre Thabiso selo seo monna oo a se buang, ke selo se seneng se buiwa ke campaign eo e ne eteletswe pele ke rre Jacob Zuma ya ga mme Nkosazana Zuma. So gare makale. Ke split sa NASREC in the face of EFF in the North West fashion. (Setswana except, 03/09/2018).*

Rre Mokgatle (Caller 3): *Mr Thabiso what this man is saying, is what said by the campaign which was led by Mr Jacob Zuma of Mrs Nkosazana Zuma. So we are not surprise. It's the NASREC split in the face of EFF in the North West fashion (English translated except, 03/09/2018).*

In the above excerpts, the researcher establishes identity politics articulated by the three callers. The use of 'here' and 'we' reference to North West Province suggests the 'Them and Us' given that the party's genesis is Kwa-Zulu Natal, which is deemed the stronghold of the former president Jacob Zuma. The callers also view the formation of Mazibuye African Congress with suspicions. Thus, the result of the deliberative public sphere, that is public opinion, is always in the process of formation. This process of development or *Bildung* is succinctly explained by Chamber (1995) as follow: The rationality of public opinion and will formation in general does not depend on citizens reaching a rational consensus on all issues. A discursively formed public opinion can represent a process of *Bildung* or education in which citizens build better foundations to their opinions through discursive interaction. Through discursive interaction on various issues from who are we? To the best means of securing deficit reduction, citizens become more informed about the issues; they become aware of what others think and feel; they re-evaluate their positions in light of criticism and argument; in short, by defending their opinions with

reason their opinions become more reasoned. The result of such interaction is that public opinion and the exercise of democratic responsibility are embedded in reasoned convictions, although reasoned convictions do not always need to reflect a consensus on an issue (Chamber, 1995: 238-239). By presupposing the reaching of understanding, and in some cases agreement, participants of argumentation in the above episodes are “committing themselves to an ongoing learning process involving rational-critical deliberations that challenge pre-discursive positions and move subjects towards more reasonable and publicly-oriented opinions” (Dahlberg, 2014: 12).

The concept of the public sphere is a space of public communication within democracy that links public opinion, “the tasks of criticism and control which a public body of citizens informally --and, in periodic elections, formally as well- practices vis-d-vis the ruling structure organized in the form of a state” (Habermas, 1964:49). The public sphere is, therefore, understood as a space where citizens speak out and express their interests towards the political system, and thereby try to influence and control it. Public service broadcasting is thus a constitutive part of public sphere where it “serves as informant, controller and also as a platform for participation and debate – as well as an actor” (Thomas, 2003: 35-36). If the citizenry is to play a role in a democracy, then it needs access to an institutionally guaranteed forum in which to express their opinions and to question established power. As a result, the debate about public participation of citizens in political communication leads to questions about the media as a public sphere where the relations between established power and the citizenry take place (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994: 10). *Motsweding FM* as a public broadcaster, thus play critical role in engendering democratic participation which is at the heart of its public mandate by allowing expression of public opinions and questioning the established power.

6.2.1 Discussing The Land Issue

The land question opened sentiments of ethnicity in the public sphere. These ethnic sentiments were vividly expressed on *Boresetse* news and current episodes of the 5th of July 2018. The episodes' theme was The Ad Hoc Committee on Amending Section 25 of the Constitution of South Africa to look into the possibility of land redistribution without compensation. This section states that "property may be expropriated only in terms of law of general application... subject to compensation, the amount of which and the time and manner of payment of which have either been agreed to by those affected or decided or approved by a court".

The mediated public sphere or debate on the land question on *Motsweding* FM news and current programme took place subsequent to thousands of King Goodwill Zwelithini's subjects gathering in Ulundi, Kwa-Zulu Natal province for a meeting to discuss the issue of communal land. The King made a controversial statement when threatening to protect the Zulu people's land at all costs. The pretext for the meeting was perceived by callers in the context of mobilising resistance to proposals that the Ingonyama Trust Act be revisited in order to ensure it does not infringe on the rights of those citizens who live in area under its jurisdiction. The meeting came amidst the report of the Parliament's High Level Panel led by former president Kgalema Motlanthe which was widely interpreted to effectively mean the expropriation of the Ingonyama Trust's land without compensation. The report which, among other things, recommended that Ingonyama Trust be dissolved appeared to have stirred fear among certain sector of society. The guest was Justice and Constitutional Development Minister Ronald Lamola. The presenter Ms Refiloe Seboko by asking the question.

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): Let me first ask this question quickly. We know that currently the parliament constitutional review committee...they are continuing on the possible amendment of section 25 of the constitution to allow for expropriation of land without compensation. In relation to what has been happening during these public hearing, are you not concern that the land issue is now...it seems to be dividing the country along colour and ethnic lines?

Minister Lamola (Minister): It is not dividing people. I have attended, I think three of the hearing. One in Mable Hall in Limpopo, an another in Mbombela Nelspruit and another part of Mpumalanga. And what I have seen is that people are making contribution. Although you can see that contribution come from the type of colour but also a class issue. Its related to how people are related to the land. For example, you hear farm workers say: we reside in this land, we work in this land, we want to have access to this land, we are being evicted from time to time. So we being abuse in our farms. So it is on the basis of class relations to the land. Those that are white will raise the issue that there is no need and so forth. But it is also because of their class relations to the land on the basis that most of them are property owners or land owners.

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): Let's take listeners to either ask question or make contribution.

The deliberative public sphere, as the ideal for citizen participation in politics, involves rational debate between citizens over common problems leading to critically informed public opinion that can guide and scrutinize official decision-making processes (Dahlberg, 2007: 128). The principle of rational-critical deliberation is "the form of communication that enables the formation of a public sphere of reasoned deliberation through which public opinion develops that can hold formal decision-making accountable" (Dahlberg, 2014: 12-18).

Dr Mmolawa, (Caller 1) (excerpt) *We are not saying letswe mo magosing. We are simply saying...if e le gore o kereye lefatshe le le tonna jaana, a magosi otlhe mo diporofenseng a fiwe mafatshe a kanaka a trust engonyama enang le ona (Setswana except 05/09/2018).*

Dr Mmolawa (Caller 1) (excerpt) *We are not saying the land should be taken from chiefs. We are simply saying...if he gets such a huge land, let's all the chiefs be given equal portion land similar to the one under **Ingonyama Trust** (English translated except, 05/09/2018).*

Nxethile (Caller 2), (excerpt) *Ba ya go dirang ka lefatshe la ka kwa Zulu-Natal. Jaaka ke utlwa go twe ho sofiwa (Setswana except 05/09/2018).*

Nxethile (Caller 2), (excerpt) *What are they going to do with the land in Kwa Zulu Natal? Since I hear people saying there will be death (English translated except, 05/09/2018).*

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *Most of our listeners or two of the callers that we have got...they are raising the issue of Ingonyama trust and the Zulu King who wants Ingonyama Trust to remain intact. Have you been...maybe been misunderstood as particularly to traditional leaders. How are you responding to the issue in particular?*

Minister Lamola (Guest): *That issue is look at comprehensively with all communal land. As you might have heard when I started. I said we will look at all the communal land, including the one that belong to Ingonyama Trust. It will not be looked at in isolation, and there is no specific target or focus on Ingonyama Trust. But it's the whole governance of the communal land across the country*

The line of questioning and comments from the audience in the excerpt above present a failure on the part of the programme presenter to confront issues of ethnicity and assist in finding the resolution where all South Africans can find a common heritage, common share holding sharing of the land. The media must also open dialogue where all citizens feel that they have an opportunity to contribute to public discourse on the land, on how they intend to unlock the economic opportunities, not only for farming but also how they can reside or where they can start small business.

6.2.2 Discussing The State Capture

The State Capture Commission also became the main focus of the mediated public sphere in 2008. The commission is chaired by Deputy Judge Raymond Zondo, and aims to investigate the extent to which tools and organs of government have been unduly and inappropriately used to enrich and benefit private citizens and individuals, by virtue of them enjoying closeness to political power. The interest of the ordinary South African in the process is to see years' worth of unlawful trade – at the expense of public resources – exposed, and justice served for those who were directly and indirectly affected by state capture. In this *Boresetse* news and current affairs episodes of 20th of August 2018 the presenter Refiloe Seboko gave the audience the opportunity to express their fear, aspirations, the prospect of success and/or failure of the commission.

The callers lack of enthusiasm on the prospect of the commission was apparently divided as some expressed deep concerns over the level of co-operation the commission might receive from the leadership of tainted former leader, while some expressed confidence and believed that the success of the commission equally depends on the courageous whistle-blowers to expose deep secrets dealings to enable it to effectively investigate and deal with state capture.

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *A o tiile moko gore diphitlhelelo tsa commission eno ditlile go ka salwa morago le gore bao ba tshwanellang ke go ka sekisiwa ba tla isiwa dikgotla tshekelo? (Setswana except, 20/08/2018)*

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *Are confident that the findings of this commission will be followed and those implicated be convicted? (English translated except, 20/08/2018).*

Thabang (caller 1) from Vanderbijlpark: Go na le dienquiry tse dingata tseo etsagalang. But after tsona ga gona anybody oo tshwarwang or ga gona le batho baba e ntse phoso. So le state capture re ntse re tlile gobona the same thing e ntse e e tsa gala ya gore go bile gwa nna le state enquiry battle batho batle go testifaya. After that what happen. Nna ke bona fela e le tshenyo ya tax payers' money (Setswana except, 20/08/2018).

Thabang (caller 1) from Vanderbijlpark: There are so many inquiries that took place. But thereafter no one is being arrested or even found guilty. So we still going to see the same thing even with State Capture happening. That there was State Capture inquiries people came to testify, after that what happen. I just see it as tax payers' money (English translated except, 20/08/2018).

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): A utlweetse Thabang. A re ye ko Sefikile re amogele Tshepo (Setswana except, 20/08/2018).

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): Thank you Thabang. Let's go to Sefikile. We welcome Thabang (English translated except, 20/08/2018).

Tshepo (caller 2): Ke na le tshepo ee tletseng ya gore dilo ditsile go tsamaya sentle. (Setswana except, 20/08/2018).

Tshepo (caller 2): I am fully confident that everything will go accordingly (English translated except, 20/08/2018).

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): Re ya ko Bethani. Re amogela Neo (Setswana except, 20/08/2018).

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): Let's go to Bethani. We welcome Neo (English translated except, 20/08/2018).

Neo (caller 3): Oa itsi nna Fifi dienqueueary tse ka modimo di ntapisitse ka go nne as ao ubuti a buile gore, ga gona na sepe seo re tlileng go se bona ka go nne, go na jaanong go biditswe e ne mopresidente nthate Jacob Zuma gore a tle le ene, a tle gore bolelela gore go diragetseng ka state capture. A tota o ka bitsa motho oo implicated go tla go re fa bopaki? (Setswana except, 20/08/2018).

Neo (caller 3): *You know Fifi, truly speaking I have heard about these inquiries in God's name as the previous caller has alluded, nothing will come out of this because as we speak the former president has been call called to testify. Can you really call an implicated person to testify? ((English translated except, 20/08/2018).*

The public sphere in communication studies was traditionally connected to the media in the sense that media constitutes one important field for public discourse and debate about current affairs is demonstrated in the episodes above, by which the forming of public opinion takes shape (Hickethier, 2000: 4). The political public sphere in which political accountability and party political debates were discussed also took place on the following episodes on the 27th September 2018 on *Boresetse* news and current affairs in which the focus was on Bricks. Zimbabwean elections featured on *Tsele Le Tsele* on the 31 of July and 02/ August 2018 in which citizens participated in international political affairs.

6.2.3 Discussing Socio-Economic Issues

The public sphere in Habermas' sense is also conceptually distinct from "the official-economy; it is not an arena of market relations, but rather one of discursive relations, a theatre for debating and deliberating rather than for buying and selling" (Fraser, 1990: 57). Kellner (1990) contends that the media, state, and business are the major institutional forces of contemporary capitalist societies. The media "mediate" between state, economy, and social life. Furthermore, the mainstream broadcasting media have not been promoting democracy or serving the public interest and thus are forfeiting their crucial structural importance in constructing a democratic society. Inequality, poverty, and unemployment are interdependent socio-economic phenomena labelled the 'triple challenge' in South Africa. There is broad consensus that youth unemployment in South Africa is critical, with latest figures confirming that one half of young people 15–34 years

are unemployed by the broad definition¹ (Statistics South Africa 2018). The following episodes aired on September, 5th 2018 demonstrate how *Boresetse* news and current affairs programme "mediate" between state, economy, and social life in serving the public interest. The episode's theme was Petrol Price Hike:

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *Ke metsotso e le masome a mabedi le boraro fela pele ga ura ya busupa. A re amogele Rre Tshoma (Setswana except, 05/09/2018).*

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *It's 6:37. Let's welcome Rre Tshoma (English translated except, 05/09/2018).*

Rre Tshoma (Caller): *Ke ne ke kopa go botsa ntate moo gore nna ho baneng ha government a sa etse Trust yeo a tla tsenyang chelete mo go yona gore a protekete gore fa Petrol le Diesel di ka nyeloha, a tseye ho tswa mo trusteng eo (Setswana except, 05/09/2018).*

Mr. Tshoma (Caller): *I would like to ask your quest why doesn't the government establish a Trust in which it would invest money in it so that when the Petrol and Diesel price increase it would just tap in it? (English translated except, 05/09/2018).*

The socio-economic challenges facing South Africa were also debated on the *Boresetse* news and current affairs on 01st of August 2018 in which the focus was unemployment; on the 19th of September 2018, the same show also discussed Eskom related matters and how they affect the economy. Fuel price hike also featured on 02 of July 2018 on *Tsele Le Tsele* where fuel hike and its effect on food security was highlighted. On the 07th of August 2018 *Tsele Le Tsele* invited the Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union (Amcu) President Joseph Mathunjwa following the union's threats that it would go on strike at Impala Platinum (Implats) and any associated companies if the mining giant retrenches 13,400 workers under its broad two-year restructuring strategy. The participants also expressed fear of what would that mean to the high level of

unemployment in the North West Province and the country at large. In modern capitalistic society, the public sphere has a “potential influence over power by forming a critical consensus which produces a coherent public opinion and by making the state accountable” to its citizens (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994: 9-35).

6.2.3.1 Discussing Gender Based Violence and Children Abuse

The public sphere has increasingly become a fundamental communication infrastructure through which citizens come to deliberate on social problems that affect their daily lives. In the quantitative audience survey, the study attempted to find out whether or not “*Motsweding FM*’s news and current affairs’ discussion segment is relevant to citizens’ empowerment in their everyday experiences of life in a democratic society. The table below which measure empowerment derive from data generated through an audience survey questionnaire.

Table 2: indicate the respondent’s agreement to the statement: “*Motsweding FM*’s current affairs’ interactive session is relevant to empowerment of citizens’ in their everyday experiences of life in a democratic society”.

Responses	Frequency	Percent
strongly disagree	4	3.1
disagree	18	13.7
undecided	14	10.7
agree	48	36.6
strongly agree	47	35.9
Total	131	100.0

At least 35.9 % of participant strongly agree, followed by 36.6% who agree, 10.7% undecided, 13.7% disagree and 3.1% strongly disagree. The table indicates that a high percentage of participants hold a view that the station’s discussion segment is relevant to

empowerment of citizens. This could be attributed to the frequency at which human rights issues relating to gender based violence and children abuse were given much attention on both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes. They created a platform for public discussion in the fight against gender based violence and children issue with focus on violence against women. Violence against women is a societal problem and can be considered a national pandemic in South Africa. The month of August in South Africa holds significance history of women's role in the liberation of the Black African population because on this month, 9 August 1956 specifically, thousands of women marched to the Union Buildings in Pretoria to protest against the pass laws. The Government of South Africa thus declared August women's month culminating into 9 August being celebrated annually as Women's day. In spite of South Africa's strong constitutional protections for human rights, public confidence in the government's preparedness to confront human rights violations remains a thorny issue in public mind. Despite its pervasiveness, gender-based violence (GBV) is one of the least talked about violations of women's rights as most of the time it takes place within the private domain and is never reported in the mass media. Gender-based violence can be described as any physical, psychological, sexual, economic, socio-cultural violation of human rights unleashed against opposite sex. It appeared to be conspicuous and widespread violation of human rights in South Africa especially in 2018.

The following episodes from *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs aired on 10th of July 2018 highlight citizen concerns pertaining to the way in which women and children are subjected to all manner of abusive. The episodes followed the men's' match titled Hundred Men March to Union Building, Pretoria organised by the Government Communication and Information System (GCIS) to highlight the plight of women and

children in South Africa. The guest was Mr Keitumetse Semakane from Government Communication and Information System (GCIS) who was interviewed by the show host Mr Thabiso Moss.

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Lone lo ikaelela go fitlhelelang ka mogwanto o wa gompiono kwa Union Building kgotsa Pretoria o e le gore o kgatlhanong le tshotlakako ya basadi le bana? (Setswana except, 10/07/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *What were you intending to achieve with today's match at Union Building or Pretoria which were against women and children abuse? (English translated except, 10/07/2018).*

Keitumetse Semakane, (Guest): *Maikaelelo a rona Rre Thabiso Moss e ne e le gore re golagane le go tsibosa setshaba ka ka karetso. Bothata bo ba tshotlakako ya basadi le bana, e le gore re romele molaetsa oo siameng tota, o totobetse wa gore re le puso re ema kgatlhanong le go sotlakakiwa ga basadi le bana mo e leng gore mo bofelong tota go isa kwa goreng basadi kgotsana makgarejwana a felelwa ke botshelo. Mme re ne rere banna ba botlhe ba itlame, ba romele molaetsa o o tletseng wa gore re kgatlhanong le tshotlakako ya basadi le bana (Setswana except, 10/07/2018).*

Keitumetse Semakane, (Guest): *Our intention Mr. Thabiso Moss was to connect and create awareness to the nation at large. This problem of women and children abuse...it was really to send the good message, a good message that we as government, we stand against women and children abuse which eventually lead to women or young women's death. But we were calling upon men to take an oath and sent a complete message that we are against women and children abuse (English translated except, 10/07/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *extract: A mogwanto o ya go thusa mo goreng basadi le bana ba seka ba sotlakakiwa mo nageng, kgotsa re bone ntlha e ee kete go a fokotsega, kgotsa go nne le boitarabologelo bongwe jo borileng? (Setswana except, 10/07/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Is this match going to assist in alleviating women and children abusive in the country or to see this issue going down or create certain degree of consciousness? (English translated except, 10/07/2018).*

Keitumetse Semakane (Guest): *Maikaelelo ke ona ao Thabiso gore mokwa o wa go sotliwa ga bana le basadi o fokotsege. Re a itsi gore re ka seka ra fedisa tshotlakako ya basadi le bana ka mogwanto o le mongwe, kgotsa ka puo e le ngwe (Setswana except, 10/07/2018).*

Keitumetse Semakane (Guest): *That our intention Thabiso to ensure that the behavior of abusing children and women is reduced. We know that we cannot end women and children abuse with just a match or through talking only (English translated except, 10/07/2018).*

The above excerpts of the interview on the 10th of July 2018 highlight unhealthy human rights culture in South Africa after almost 25-years of democracy. One of the contributing factors of women and children abuse is the patriarchal belief that many South Africans men hold. The picture painted in the interview between the presenter and guest enables active audience (callers) to contextualise their input and participate meaningfully to mediated democratic discourse. During the interview process in almost all the episodes surveyed, the researcher noticed instances whereby the presenters create the opportunity for the listeners to call-in and send comments regarding the topic under discussion as per the example below:

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *Some a mabedi le borataro marago fela ga ura ya borataro. Moeng warona ke Rre Keitumetse Semakane go tswa GCIS lefapha la tlhaeletsano la puso. Re bua le bone, batlhotse ba rulagantse mogwanto gompiano o o kgatlhanong le tiriso dikgoka kgatlhanong le batsadi le bana... a re utlwe gore o reng mo 0898602233. Ntle le fao dipotso le ditshwaelo tsa gago di goroga ko tsebeng ya Facebook ya dikgang@motswedding (Setswana except, 10/07/2018).*

Thabiso Moss (Presenter): *The time is 6:23. Our visitor is Mr. Keitumetse Semakane from (GCIS). We are talking to them. They had organised a match today which is against women and children abuse...let's hear you on 0898602233. Besides that, questions and comments can be send to our Facebook account at dikgang@motswedding (English translated except, 10/07/2018).*

Meshack Sono (Caller 1): *Rre Thabiso Moss ene e kete...ke kgatho e ntle thata e puso ee tsereng. E ntle thata thata...mme fela ke ne ke ka itirela boikuelo...gore e kete puso e ka tsaya this thing ya simololala go e e baya go ya ka diporofense. Mme segolo se tonna, e re fa ba itsisa mo diporofenseng babo bae baya mo diwekenteng ka gore o tla e la tlhoko gore borre ba le bantsi ba a bereka mo gare ga beke (Setswana except, 10/07/2018).*

Meshach Sono (Caller 1): *Mr. Thabiso Moss I wish...that's really a step towards a good direction of what the government is doing. It's really really good...however, I would like to make an appeal...that the government could take this to other provinces. But the greatest thing when they take it to the provinces, it should be during the weekends because you would realise that most of the men are working during the week (English translated except, 10/07/2018).*

Ace (Caller 3): *The only way eo re yang go fenya selo se mo Afrika Borwa ke go bua ka go lekana mo bathong ba botlhe, go sa kgathalsege gore a motho ke celebrity kgotsa jang. Fa re ka tsewe ka go lekana ba rotlhe, tsatsi lengwe re ya go fenya selo se. (Setswana except, 10/07/2018).*

Ace (Caller 3): *The only way we would defeat this thing in South Africa is to be treated equally, irrespective of whether the person is celebrity or not. If we could be treated equally. One day we will defeat this thing (English translated except, 10/07/2018).*

In the above excerpts of audience participation from the episodes aired on the 10th of July 2018, the researcher noticed incidents whereby almost four callers who were men express concerns about gender based violence and children abuse. The callers took the advantage of the public sphere to persuade the powers that may be to consider take the awareness to other provinces in the quest of combating the pandemic of gender based violence and children abuse. Thus, the public sphere becomes “more than merely an arena for talking politics, it is the primary site for detecting problems and for the deliberation of citizens which are necessary for robust democracy” (Flynn, 2004: 441).

The table below measure issues covered by the station derive from data generated through an audience survey questionnaire.

Table 3: Issues covered on *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs discussions

Responses	Frequency	Percent
ISSUES		
gender based violence/sexuality	29	17.7%
racial tensions	15	9.1%
service delivery protest	40	24.4%
poverty, inequality and unemployment	35	21.3%
corruption and maladministration	23	14.0%
no comment	22	13.4%
Total	164	100.0%

This indicate the respond rate measuring empowerment as derive from data generated through audience survey questionnaire. The Table (ref. 4) below indicate the respondents rating of the level of engagement (discussion) on the issues mentioned on Table 3 above.

Table 4: Respondents rating of the level of engagement (discussion) of the issues mentioned above on *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs

Responses	Frequency	Percent
no comment	29	21.8
disempowering	28	21.1
empowering	76	57.1
Total	133	100.0

The above statistical analysis in Table 2 show issues covered on *Motsweding* FM's News and Current Affairs discussions and Table 3 shows respondents rating of the level of engagement (discussion) of the issues indicate that at least 21.1% feel disempowered by the level of engagement, 57.1% feel of the respondents feel empowered whereas 21.8%

had no comment. The interview reveals that the level of engagement depends on the proximity of the issue under discussion to citizens or audience.

Boitumelo Korogo, *Motsweding* FM, News and Current Affairs Executive Producer stated in an Interview that the level of participation depends on the topic at hand. He stated that *“when it’s more closer to our people, the level of participation is high, you know, when you, for example, when you talk about poverty, the triple challenges; inequality, poverty and unemployment, when you talk about things which very close to our people, things that are bread and butter issues, that’s where you will see the level of participation, when you talk politics, people will be more interested but when you talk about, things that, for example, foreign issues, then you will see the level of participants is low. So the kind of topic you bring to the table will determine the level of participation from our listeners”* (**Korogo excerpt interview, Appendix C**).

The interview disconfirms the 57.1% of respondents’ view who feel empowered on the basis of the level of engagement. The producers’ in the following interview extract expressed his concern regarding the level of engagement among the callers which diverges from participants rating of the show.

Boitumelo Korogo (Producer): *“I am one person who has reservation with the level of engagement of our listeners on issues, especially PBS stations, e.g. Thobela, Motsweding, Lesedi, you tend to...otherwise that our people are not up to scratch in terms of to...when you compare them to our sister station like SAFM. So I think we need to do a lot”* (**Korogo excerpt interview, Appendix C**).

The degree to which participants lack understanding or what the literature commonly referred to as ‘political knowledge’ of issues under discussion is evident in most of the episodes surveyed between July-September 2018 as maximum number of callers asked questions and or seconded the quest/ expert’s views. The participants rarely challenged

the guest or expert position, or offered alternative views on issues discussed. News media as an important source for political information contribute to political learning. The knowledge about political affairs is generally seen as a precursor for vigorous and healthy participatory in the democratic process. Political knowledge is a crucial aspect in becoming an engaged citizen. In order to participate, citizens of democracies must understand the processes and structures of the political system around them (Sotirovic and McLeod, 2004). Moeller and de Vreese (2015:2) contend that the relationship of news use and political knowledge is reciprocal, as political knowledge is a powerful predictor of news use. In fact, knowing about politics is virtually a precondition to make sense of news stories. Knowledge about political structures, actors, and processes provides the context in which new information is processed. Without basic political knowledge, new information remains largely meaningless.

The legal framework of Rape and Sexual Harassment issue was debated on *Boresetse* news and current affairs in August 24th 2018 episode in an interview with law expert Mr. Joseph Modise. The presenter, Refiloe Seboko, began the show by painting a horrible picture of gender relations by highlighting gender based violence cases that attracted media, by extension, public attention. The death of 23-year-old Rhodes University law student and anti-rape activist in South Africa, Khensani Maseko sent shock waves throughout the country in August 2018 and incited dialogue about simmering issue of rape culture within the institutions of higher learning. The late Maseko committed suicide - because she had been raped allegedly by her boyfriend. The guest emphasised on the element of consent as it relates to engaging in sexual activity being an agreement between two parties. The discussion undertook to eliminate societal misconception of thinking that the fact of being in a relationship, married or otherwise means partners have

blanket consent to engage in sexual activity. In the except (August 24th 2018) below, *Boresetse* news and current affairs discussions segment thrives to come closest to exemplifying the liberal ideal of informed, rational and inclusive public debate as the space of interrogating social ills confronting the nation. This is the kind of talk which aims at resolving conflicts, and protecting one's interests. *Boresetse* news and current affairs discussions carries the promise of a number of salutary effects that can be summarized as follows: public deliberation means a collaborative argumentative effort to obtain collectively acceptable solutions to problems or resolutions of conflict. Even where a consensus is not obtained or expected, public deliberation should lead to learning effects, to an enrichment of the "stock" of arguments and ideas, to a reflective examination and possibly transformation of one's own convictions and preferences, to a certain degree of understanding and respect for opposing positions, and with all that to a higher degree of rationality and legitimacy of political decisions (Peters, 2005: 173).

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *Rre Modise mme a tle re simolole puisano ya rona ka gore molao fa o tlhalosa petelelo, o e tlhalosa jang? (Setswana except, 24/08/2018).*

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *Mr. Modise lets begin our conversation by asking what is the legal definition of rape? (English translated except, 24/08/2018).*

Joseph Modise (Guest): *Any person who unlawfully and intentionally commits an act of sexual penetration with a complainant without the consent of complainant is guilty of the offence of rape.*

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *Re tlhalosetse gore molao o reng fa go na le kgolagano ya go gore motho o ke ratanang le ene, kana o ke nyalaneng le ene o ka kgona go ntato fatsa ka petelelo? (Setswana except, 24/08/2018).*

Refiloe Seboko (Presenter): *Explain to us what the law says in case there is a relationship with the person I love (sexual partner) or the one I am married to; can he/she accuse me of raping her/him? English translated except, 24/08/2018).*

Joseph Modise (Guest): *The key word is consent.*

Advocate Joseph Modise's response to the presenter, Refiloe Seboko, in the excerpt above indicates the extent to which citizenship as rights was realised as the information provided by the guest enables citizens to act as agents (Lister 1998: 228). These rights include "access to information, advice and analysis that enables them to know their rights and to pursue them effectively; access to the broadest possible range of interpretation and debate on areas that involve political choices; the right to have one's experiences, beliefs and aspirations represented without distortion; and the right to participate in public culture by speaking in one's own voice, registering dissent and promoting alternatives" (Murdock and Golding, 2005: 65-66). In particular, gender based violence and children abuse, are contentious issues in the society (South Africa) and constitute gross violation of human rights as enshrined in the constitution. Violence against women, children and young girls is contrary to all standards that make a society free and safe. It is against the fundamental principles of human rights and freedoms. It is an attack against the inherent equality of women and young girls with men and young boys, hence, against the fundamental precept of equality of all human beings. The state bears the most responsibility for ensuring the freedom of women and girls from violence and abuse. This, it is expected to do by enacting laws and policies that ensure gender equality and punish discrimination and violence against women and young girls. The state is also expected to put in place mechanisms that address the social and cultural conditions that nurture violent masculinity and discrimination against women and girls.

In the episodes surveyed between July and September 2018, the study established that audience participation on *both Motswedding* FM's news and current affairs programmes *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* is often found lacking in terms of the ideals of rational-critical deliberation. The theory of democracy has long designated citizen deliberation as

a foundation of participatory (discursive) democracy (Barber, 1984). The research discovered silence in terms of reason critique and exchange of views from both presenters and participants. This was established as callers are given the opportunity to ask a question and/or express a view on the issue concerning the subject matter without the presenters cross examining audience position. The principles for rational-critical deliberation which appear silent on both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* episodes surveyed, are understood to “involve inclusive, reasoned, reciprocal, reflexive, sincere, and coercion-free argumentation” (Dahlberg, 2013: 4). Public deliberation is founded on the competition between as well as the exchange of ideas in a society-wide forum. Fishkin (2009) argues that “the quality of deliberation is a product of access to relevant and accurate information; participants’ ability to respond to arguments they encounter; representation of the major position of the public during the deliberation; sincere weighing of the arguments by participants; and equal consideration of the arguments, independent of the participants who offer them”. *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes’ public deliberation must be competitive so as to ensure that citizens have an opportunity to choose between “alternative options and thus to materially exercise their right to freedom of opinion” (Wessler, 2008: 3).

Theorists of democracy frequently envisage public deliberation as being indispensable to the working of democracy (Strandberg, 2015: 451). The proponents of deliberation highlight that vigorous citizen deliberation leads to reflection and learning, awareness of similarities and appreciation of differing perspectives, and convergence toward a common shared perspective (Benhabib, 1992; Gutmann and Thompson, 1996). These attributes are crucial to active citizen participation and informs the extent to which one is knowledgeable and or empowered about the subject matter. As noted in both the

conceptual and theoretical framework, the most important normative claims in the deliberative tradition concern the question of *how* public deliberation should be conducted and, particularly, how ideas should be related to each other in exchange. The exchange of ideas on both sides of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* presenters, guests and audience should “first of all take the form of giving justifications for one’s own claims, demanding justifications from others, and actively engaging with their positions and justifications by rebutting them and/or refining one’s own arguments. The central value of justification and rebuttal/refinement is emphasized by many theorists in the deliberative tradition and analysts of media content” (Wessler, 2008: 4).

However, in all the episodes of *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* surveyed from July-September 2018, the researcher established a pattern whereby four to five callers get the opportunity to call and comment, express their views and/or to ask questions. **Refiloe Seboko** describes the opening of lines for listeners to make comments as the opportunity to gives them a chance “to engage on issues of national importance and raise their concerns about what is happening in their areas. This is also done to hear their thoughts about how they think things should be changed to improve the state of affairs in the country”. (**Appendix L, E-Mail Interview**). The callers in most instances are regular contributors on both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes discussions. **Boitumelo Korogo** confirmed this in an interview as quoted saying:

“I sometimes wonder if whether our listeners phone to share their input and make a meaningful contribution or they phone just for celebrity status because if you listen to Motsweding FM, you have the same listeners, same...say... our listeners are expert in everything (Korogo excerpt interview, Appendix C).

The above stated views from both the producer and the presenter's views could be associated with Dahlberg's (2013) argument as he states that "inclusion in the public sphere may be limited by inequalities within discourse, where some dominate discourse and others struggle to get their voices heard. It may also be limited by inequalities from outside of discourse, such as when a certain level of material wealth or education is required to take part in proceedings. This in turn presupposes that social inequalities of all types (based on money, skills, status, etc.) do not impact upon participation. Because discourse cannot be insulated from socio-economic disparities, substantive social equality is also ideally presupposed" (Dahlberg, 2013: 9). He further reiterates that even when inclusion is formalized, as in the case of *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs programmes, informal restrictions may hinder participation, restrictions that result from social and cultural inequalities (Dahlberg, 2013: 9). The view suggests that citizen participation is to a certain extent determined by the socio-economics circumstances that audience find themselves in; for example, the ability to afford airtime and data. The two news and current affairs programmes, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* attempt to bridge this inequality by encouraging those who may be unable to call-in to send the text message through *Motsweding* FM Facebook account. This was established during the interview with **Boitumelo Korogo**. He stated that on the same slot of audience participation they allow listeners a chance to interact with these quests, either telephonically or via social media. In this case, preferably "we use Facebook" (**Korogo excerpt interview, Appendix C**). **Refiloe Seboko**, *Boretese* news and current affairs presenter confirmed this in the excerpt below:

Refiloe Seboko, (Presenter): "On a daily basis, listeners are given a chance to either send a voice note, email or comment on a Facebook status on the topic of the day" (**Appendix L, E- Mail Interview**).

The presenters on both *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs read at least eight to ten Facebook comments and questions conveyed by the listeners and summarise them for the quest/expert to respond. The following are some of the Facebook comments and questions read by both presenters during their programmes covering socio-economic and political issues discussed.

Olebogeng Kgoroba (Listener): *“Ruri Kgang ya lefatshe e nkama maikutlo. Ke ne ke solofetse fa lefatshe le tla tsewa mo dia atleeng tsa basweu le go busetswa bantsho ka le thopilwe mo go bona. Jaanong fa e le gore section 25 e tobane le go amogwa le bantsho lefatshe ka maikaelelo...seo ga se tarabollo ee ke neng ke e solofetse (Setswana except, 05/07/ 2018).*

Olebogeng Kgoroba (Listener): *“The land issue really an emotive issue to me. I thought the land would be taken from the hand of white and be put under the control of blacks having been forcefully taken from them. Now if section 25 also expropriate land from blacks with the intentions...that is not the solution I was expecting” (English translated except, 05/07/ 2018).*

Thapelo Matati (Listener): *“Potso ya ka ke gore a gago hiriwe go ya ka ditokomane tsa tiro eo o tla e berekang?” Tsele Le Tsele aired on the 19th of September 2018 (Setswana except),*

Thapelo Matati (Listener): *“My question is, Aren’t you employed according to the qualification of the work done”? Tsele Le Tsele aired on the 19th of September 2018 (English translated except).*

Lebethe Phukumus (Listener): *“Nna ga ke dumalane le Rre Ben Bole ka tshweetso ya go tsaya bomeiyara ba pele go ba dira diadministrator” Tsele Le Tsele aired on the 19th of September 2018 (Setswana except),*

Lebethe Phukumusi (Listener): *“I disagree with Mr. Ben Bole’s decision of taking former majors as administrators” Tsele Le Tsele aired on the 19th of September 2018 (English translated except).*

New Media through the use of Facebook has enable *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes as the public sphere to ensure political accountability between the state, business and citizens through the mediation of talk intended to solve socio-economic and political problems. Schudson (1997) views citizen participation as a “problem-solving talk”. In this view, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs discursive space is “distinctive in its promise of participation and apparent challenging of traditional hierarchies. It involves real people talking about real life experiences, which gives them a claim to authenticity that assists in the programmes’ championing of the ordinary citizens” (Wood, 2014: 66). The participants’ use of Facebook to express their comments and ask questions through the mediated public sphere demonstrates the power and the influence of the programmes as participatory democratic avenues crucial for democracy and good governance with their ability to enable critical scrutiny of everyday communicative practices. Notwithstanding the role of social media in maximizing audience participation in radio broadcast debate, its use also contributes to lack of deliberation. The study discovered this as presenters relay their views and comments which mostly come as questions to the public/audience. In keeping with Peters (2001: 28), public deliberation should meet standard of “openness or equal opportunity for topics, perspectives, interpretations, ideas, and arguments.

6.2.4. Summary

This chapter mainly focused on the analyses and interpretation of the themes identified in *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs episodes during the period under investigation which ranges from socio-economic and political issues evident within the contents of archival recorded of the selected episodes in which. The democratic quality of everyday communicative practices through which the public sphere is

constituted on *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs, *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* revealed lack of deliberation and the management of citizen participation in relation to the station's ability to set agenda for public discourse.

CHAPTER SEVEN:

REFLECTIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Reflections, Conclusions and Recommendations

The study set out to examine the extent to which *Motsweding* FM, part of the South African Broadcasting Corporation, broadcasts in quest for citizen's democratic participation, with the focus on *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes. The study seeks to determine the efficiency of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes in forming the mediated democratic public discourse, the extent to which mediated democratic public discourse as offered by these two programmes hold official to account on issues of governance within democratic society and well as the extent to which these programmes are good democratic platform that provide citizens an opportunity to deliberate on issues of common concern. The thesis established that the role of expert/ guest help citizens to develop the capabilities to make sense of the crucial issues being discussed in the public sphere. Of particular interest to the researcher is how the public broadcaster could organise discussion programmes in which important socio-economic and political issues regarding good governance, political empowerment and participation to bring about social change and foster the culture of human rights considering gender based violence and children abuse in society.

Dahlgren (2009: 108) also argues that "if citizens are to become empowered, they must have access to reliable reports, analysis, discussions and debates around current affairs". This kind of analysis, discussions and debates is likely to deal with ignorance among people. Based on empirical evidence, in the examination of the appropriate of *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* programmes in forming a public sphere in which citizens participate

democratically in mediated public discourse, it was discovered that although *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* provides space for citizens to participate in current affairs, the form and shape of participation is silent in meeting the criteria of public deliberation. Although *Motsweding* FM news and current affairs programmes function as a form of the public sphere, they fundamentally function as a "thin" and or imperfect public sphere (Gerstl-Pepin, 2002). The logic being that critical rational deliberation about issues of general concern hardly took place in most episodes surveyed and analysed. The findings of the study have established the deficiency of deliberation in *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs programs and the framing as well as management of citizen participation. The study also established that *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs' space for free expression is elitism and promotes dominant ideology. As a result, the traditional polarization of the private and public is often eroded (Wood, 2014: 65). The programmes are structured in such a way that the production is managed in the sense that audience are unable to set the agenda for public discussion.

Methodologically, the study relied on mixed method approach employing both qualitative and quantitative frameworks to address the research objectives. The research investigates *Motsweding* FM (one of the 18 SABC's radio station) as a case study in which two programmes are selected as unit of analysis. Utilizing embedded case study research design, the study summarised various *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs dialogic exchange episodes to highlight some of participatory strategies such as agenda setting, the eyewitness (interviews with ordinary man and woman on the street), emailed interviews responses of *Boresetse* news and current affairs presenter, as well as qualitative interview with *Motsweding* FM Senior News and Current Affairs producer and

producer of *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. Also included were audience phone-ins and social media text such Facebook messages read by presenters during the show were scrutinised in establishing their meaning. Thematic content data analysis was used to code and interpret data in an attempt to understand the role of *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes as a public sphere in enabling citizenship and democratic expression. The study analysed the content, structure and strategies used by *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs programmes to encourage and foster democratic participation in which citizens deliberate on matter of common concern. The study determined how the two programmes enable the formation of rational public opinion that can critically guide political systems by hold formal government at local, provincial and national sphere accountable. The themes identified included political, economic and social events that took place during the period of the study.

The study intended to get the views of both producers and presenters of the programmes under investigation. However, the data collected is limited to one producer and one presenter. The two personnel (producer and presenter) initially agreed to participate in the state and later withdrawn quietly. Hard as it may be to accept, the researcher realised that some journalists have little or no appreciation of what the profession entails or what their social responsibility is, the extent to which the content the they produce and present have far reaching consequence in society due to lack of holistic education and training. They stumbled into the profession by default. The unwillingness on part of some of *Motsweding* FM journalists to participate contributed to these limitations. In addition, the audience survey conducted also indicates limited or lack of audience' political capital and understanding of the role of news media in society. The thesis is rooted on the idea that

democratic citizen participation is necessary in facilitating the kind of public dialogue necessary to sustain a vibrant democracy. A modern democratic society constitutes a remarkable diversity of individuals, each with their own understandings, preferences, experiences, beliefs, and values. *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs can play a significant role in encouraging open dialogue in conditions that invite people to express their various perspectives. This has the potential to critically develop citizen's ability to make informed and meaningful choices.

The study also utilises theoretical frames drawn from Habermasian public sphere and participatory liberal democratic theories. The theories privilege citizens' participation as vital to the well-functioning and robust democratic political process. In other words, citizenship and dialogue are considered to be the essential elements of democracy. The work of Chantal Mouffe among others was used to critique Habermasian public sphere element of critical rational discussion which is fundamental to democratic participation. Barber (1984) also takes issue with the 'thin' democracy associated with elections and opposition politics in liberal democracy. The liberal media system by its nature has been criticised for promoting elite ideology. The empowerment theory also claims that citizen's democratic participation leads to citizens being empowered. However, the theory has been criticised for ignoring cultural, political and economic factors that interplay in the attainment of empowerment. For example, Fenton and Barassi (2011) and Stiegler (2009) have argued that what other scholars call empowerment as a result of their participation is not really empowerment, but a drive to push self/individualised interest. Anthony Giddens' Structuration Theory was interrogated to the extent to which it reflects how journalistic activities and their products (news) are shaped by the structure, suggesting that people's empowerment is enabled and constrained by the very same structure. In

this sense, radio broadcasting is a structure that instantaneously enables and constrains instrumental and dialogic deliberations. The study engaged with the literature on public service broadcasting and its characteristics concerning to how they facilitate and encourage citizen participation.

The thesis also examined critical literature on talk radio in Africa (Bosch, 2011, Hungbo, 2013), indigenous language media and its place in strengthening the democratic process of a society, citizen's participation and democratic sustenance. For example, Salawu and Chibita (2016) and Salawu (2018), among others, are of the view that indigenous language media usage encourages democratic participation and sustenance. Akpojivi and Fosu (2016) as well as Karikari, (2000) also argue that indigenous language media strengthen democratic processes because of citizen's ability to understand and contribute to media discourse. The research further engaged with aspects of media and citizenship. The literature on media and citizenship argues that democratic participation is linked with citizens' exposure to the news media of which radio broadcasting account to substantial number of the public due to its affordability and accessibility to almost everyone.

The study therefore recommends that, notwithstanding that *Motsweding* FM as a public broadcaster is legislated to offer diverse programmes ranging from news and current affairs, sports, educational and children programmes, dramas etc., with a (24) twenty-four-hour programme schedule, *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* provide news and current affairs discussion segment should be maximised to enable the programmes to offer enough space for citizens to democratically participate and set agenda in public discourse. For example, the dominant theme in participatory liberal theory is the desirability of maximizing the participation of citizens in the public debate that affects their

lives (Ferree et al. 2002a: 295). In such an open space there may be more chances for multiple voices to be heard, more problems to be brought to public attention and more chances for citizens to find what they want to hear or know. In others worlds, open line democratic participation may act as an early warning signal to media attention as citizens have the opportunity to raise any current affair issues they deem important.

The study further suggests that given the proliferation of social media use, the station may consider posting the topic of the day on their social media network. This could arguably assist the listeners, in particular those who participate in the discussion, to have enough time to formulate their thoughts well in advance. That strategy might assist participants to make valuable contribution in relation to their comments and views as well as asking informed and thought provoking questions in the discussion at hand. The study suggests to future researcher who are interested in exploring media and citizen participation to look into 'focus group interview' or telephonic interview with active participants (audience) in order to get in-depth understanding of what motivate them to participate in public affairs radio programmes rather than surveying the general audience. Krampen (1991) suggests that motivation to participate in politics is a consequence of expectations one has of one's political surroundings or being critically aware of his surroundings. Individual citizens' motivation is one of the most prominent causes of participation (Verba et al. 1995). Feldman and Kawakami (1991: 65-80) study supports this view as they found that "those who are more exposed and interested in political information in the media were more politically active". This implies that citizens with high political efficacy are more likely to engage in politics and be critically conscious of their socio-economic and political environment.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aalberg, T., and Curran, J. (2012). *How Media Inform Democracy: A Comparative Approach*, Routledge: New York and London.
- Aalberg, T., van Aelst, P., and Curran, J. (2012). Media Systems and the Political Environment: A Cross-National Comparison, In Aalberg, T. and Curran, J. (eds) *How Media Inform Democracy: A Comparative Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Aarts, K., Fladmore, A., and Stromback, J. (2012). Media, Political Trust, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Perspective. In Aalberg, T. and Curran, J. (eds) *How Media Inform Democracy: A Comparative Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Addis, A. (2007). Constitutionalising Deliberative Democracy in Multilingual Societies. *Berkeley Journal of International Law*, Volume 25, Issue 2.
- Ader, C. R. (1995). A longitudinal Study of Agenda Setting for the Issues of Environmental Pollution. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 72 (2): 300-311.
- Ake, C. (2000). *The feasibility of democracy in Africa*: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa; African Books Collective, Dakar: Oxford
- Akpojivi, U., and Fosu, M. (2016). Indigenous Language Broadcasting in Ghana: Retrospect and Prospect, in Salawu, A., and Chibita, M. B. (2016). *Indigenous Language Media, Language Politics and Democracy in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Althusser, L. (1984). *Essays on Ideology*, London: Verso.
- American Psychological Association. (1992). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*.
- American Psychologist, 47, 1597–1611. Canadian Psychological Association. (1991). *Canadian code of ethics for psychologists*. Ottawa: Author.

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, R., Dardenne, R., and Killenberg, G. (1994). *The Conversation of Journalism: Communication, Community, and News*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Anderson, S, C, Wilson, M. K., Mwansa, L. K., and Osei-Hwedie, K. (1994). Empowerment and Social Work Education and Practice in Africa, *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, 9, (2): 71-86.
- Ansah, P. A. V. (1988). In Search of a Role for the African Media in the Democratic Process. *African Media Review* Vol.2 No. 2.
- Archer, M.S. (1990). Human Agency and Social Structure: A Critique of Giddens, in J. Clark and C. Modgil (Eds), *Anthony Giddens, Consensus and Controversy*, Basingstoke, Falmer.
- Archer, M.S. (1996). Culture and agency: The place of culture in social theory Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1977). *Between Past and Future*, New York: Penguin.
- Asiamah, N., Mensah, H. K., and Oteng-Abayie, E. F. (2017). General, Target, Accessible Population: Demystifying the Concepts for Effective Sampling. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(6), 1607-1622.
- Atkin, C. K., Galloway, J., and Nayman, O. B. (1976). News Media Exposure, Political Knowledge and Campaign Interest. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*. 53: 231-237.
- Avril, E., and Neem, J. N. (2015). *Democracy, Participation and Contestation Civil Society, Governance and the Future of Liberal Democracy*: Routledge: London.

- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey Research Methods*, Second Edition. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Babbie, E. (1995). *The Practice of Social Research*, 7th ed. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bachrach, P., and Botwinick, A. (1992). *Power and Empowerment: A Radical Theory of Participatory Democracy*. Temple Univ. Press, Philadelphia, Penn.
- Baglioni, S. (2007). The Effects of Direct Democracy and City Size on Political Participation, The Swiss Case, in Zittel, T., and Fuchs, D. (2007). *Participatory Democracy and Political Participation. Can Participatory Engineering Bring Citizens Back in?* Routledge, London.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavior Change. *Psychological Review*, 84: 191–215.
- Banerjee, I., and Seneviratne, K. (2006). Public Service Broadcasting in the Age of Globalization. AMIC.
- Barber, B. (1983). *The Logic and Limits of Trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barber, B. (1989). Public Talk and Civic Action: Education for Participating in a Strong Democracy. *Social Education*, 53(6): 355–356.
- Barber, B. (2003). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Twentieth Anniversary Edition. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Barker, D. C. (1998). The Talk-Radio Community: Non-traditional Social Networks and Political Participation. *Social Science Quarterly* 79 (2):261-72.

- Barner, C., and Rosenwein, F. E. (1985). *Psychological Perspectives on Politics*. Englewood Prentice-Hall.
- Barnes, M., Knops, A., Newman, J., and Sullivan, H. (2004). Recent Research. The Micro-Politics of Deliberation: Case Studies in Public Deliberation. *Contemporary Politics* 10 (2):93-110.
- Barone, M., and Schrof, J. (1990). The Changing Voice of Talk Radio. *U.S. News and World Report*, 51-53.
- Baxter, P., and Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- Bello, A. K., and Wilkinson, K. (2017). The Perception of Community Radio as Public Sphere and its Potential Impact on Political Action: Lessons from Tanzania. *Journal of Development and Communication Studies*, 5(1): 22- 43.
- Benhabib, S. (1992). Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, The Liberal Tradition, and Jiirgen Habermas. In Calhoun, C., (1992). *Habermas and The Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Benhabib, S. (1996). *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bennett, S. P., Flickinger, R. S., and Rhine, S. L. (2000). Political Talk over Here, over There, over Time, *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 99-119.
- Bennett, W. L. (1988). *NEWS: The Politics of Illusion*. New York: Longman.
- Benson, R., (2009). Shaping the Public Sphere: Habermas and Beyond, *Am Soc* 40:175–197.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. New York: Hafner.

- Beresford, P., and Trevillion, S. (1995). *Developing Skills for Community Care*, Arena, London, UK,
- Berry, J. Portney, K., and Thomson, K. (1993). *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Bickford, S. (1996). *The Dissonance of Democracy: Listening, Conflict and Citizenship*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Blumler, J. G. (1992). *Television and the Public Interest: Vulnerable Values in West European Broadcasting*. London, Newbury Park, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Blumler, J. G. (1993). *Making Money with Mission: Purity versus Pragmatism in Public Broadcasting*. *European Journal of Communication* (8).
- Blumler, J. G., and Hoffmann-Rein, W. (1992). New Roles for Public Service Television: In J.G. Blumler, (eds). *Television and the Public Interest: Vulnerable Values in West European Broadcasting*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Blumler, J. G., and McQuail, D. (1968). *Television in Politics: Its User and Influences*, Faber, London.
- Boeder, P., (2000). 'Habermas' Heritage: The Future of the Public Sphere in the Network Society', *Firstmonday: Peer-Reviewed Journal on the Internet*, Issue 10, 9.
- Bohman, J. (1996). *Public Deliberation. Pluralism, Complexity and Democracy*. Cambridge. MA: MIT Press.
- Bohman, J. F. (1990). Communication, Ideology, and Democratic Theory, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 84, No. 1: 93-109.
- Bolce, L., deMaio, G., and Muzzio, D. (1996). Dial-in Democracy: Talk Radio and the 1994 Election. *Political Science Quarterly*, 111(3): 457-481.

- Bolton, R. (2005), 'Habermas's Theory of Communicative Action and the Theory of Social Capital', *paper presented at the Association of American Geographers*, Denver, Colorado, April, 2.
- Bosch, T. (2011a). Talk Radio, Democracy and Citizenship in (South) Africa, in Wasserman, H. (2011). *Popular Media, Democracy and Development in Africa*, Routledge, London.
- Bosch, T. (2011b). Talk Radio, Democracy and the Public Sphere: 567MW in Cape Town; in Gunner, L, Ligaga, D and Moyo, D (eds). *Radio in Africa: Publics, cultures, communities*, Wits University Press, Johannesburg.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyte, H. C. (1995). Public Opinion as Public Judgment. In Glasser, T. L. and Salmon C. T. (Eds.). *Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent*. New York: Guilford.
- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3: 77–101.
- Brown, M. P. (1994). The Work of City Politics: Citizenship through Employment in the Local Response to AIDS, *Environment and Planning A*, 26, 873-894.
- Brundidge, J., and Rice, R. E. (2009). Political Engagement Online: Do the Information Rich Get Richer and the Like-Minded More Similar? In Chadwick, A. and Howard, P. N. (Eds.). *The Handbook of Internet Politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Buckley, S., Duer, K., Mendel, T., and O'Siochru, S. (2008). *Broadcasting, Voice and Accountability: A Public Interest Approach to Policy, Law and Regulation*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

- Bucy, E. P., and Gregson, K. S. (2001). Media Participation: A Legitimizing Mechanism of Democracy: *New Media and Society*, Vol 2 (3): 357-380.
- Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J., and Kelshaw, T. (2002). A Conceptual Definition and Theoretical Model of Public Deliberation in Small Face-to-Face Groups. *Communication Theory*, 12:4, 399–422.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Buthelezi, T. (2016). IsiZulu Language and the Ilanga Newspaper as Catalysts for Participatory Democracy in South Africa. In Salawu, A and Chibita, M. B., (eds). *Indigenous Language Media, Language Politics and Democracy in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Cahn, E. S., and Passet, B. A. (Eds.) (1971). *Citizen Participation. Effecting Community Change*. New York: Praeger.
- Calhoun, C. (1992). Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere, in: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press:
- Calhoun, C., Gerteis, J., Moody, J., Pfaf, S., and Virk, I. (eds.). (2012). *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Callahan, K. (2007). Citizen Participation: Models and Methods, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30:11, 1179-1196.
- Cameron, R. (2011). Mixed Methods Research: The Five Ps Framework, *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, Volume 9 Issue 2: 96-108.
- Cammaerts, B., and Carpentier, N. (2007). *Reclaiming the Media: Communication Rights and Democratic Media Roles*. European Communication Research and Education Association, Intellect Ltd
- Carey, J. (1989). *Communication as Culture*. Boston. Unwin. Hyman.

- Carpentier, N. (2009). Participation is not Enough: The Conditions of Possibility of Mediated Participatory Practices. *European Journal of Communication*, 24 (4): 407-420.
- Carpentier, N. (2011). *Media and Participation. A site of ideological-democratic struggle*, Bristol: Intellect.
- Carpentier, N. (2001). Managing Audience Participation: The Construction of Participation in an Audience Discussion Programme, *European Journal of Communication*, Vol 16 (2).
- Carter, N. (2007). Workplace Democracy Turning Workers into Citizens? in Zittel, T., and Fuchs, D. (eds). *Participatory Democracy and Political Participation. Can Participatory Engineering Bring Citizens Back in?* Routledge, London.
- Chaffee, S. H., and Frank, S. (1996). How Americans Get Political Information: Print versus Broadcast News. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546: 48–58.
- Chambers, S. (2001). A Critical Theory of Civil Society, in Chambers, S and Kymlicka, W, 2001 eds. *Alternative Conceptions of Civil Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative Democratic Theory, *Annual Review of Political Science* (6): 307–326.
- Chan, J. M. (2001). Media, Democracy and Globalisation: A Comparative Framework. In: *Javnost – the Public* 8(4): 103-118.
- Check J., and Schutt R. K. (2012). *Research Methods in Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Chibita, M. B. (2016). Indigenous Language Media and Freedom of Expression in Uganda. In Salawu, A and Chibita, M. B., (eds). *Indigenous Language Media, Language Politics and Democracy in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chibita, M. B. (2011). Multiple Publics, Multiple Languages: Radio and the Contestations of Broadcasting Language Policy in Uganda, In L, Gunner., D Ligaga, and D. Moyo. (eds). *Radio in Africa: Publics, Cultures, Communities*, Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Failed States: The Abuse of Power and the Assault on Democracy*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Chong, D. (1993). How People Think, Reason and Feel about Rights and Liberties. *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (3): 867-899.
- Clarke, P. B. (1996). *Deep Citizenship*. London: Pluto Press.
- Clawson, R., and Oxley, Z. M. (2008). *Public Opinion: Democratic Ideals, Democratic Practice*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Cohen, A., Vigoda, E., and Samorly, A. (2001). Analysis of the Mediating Effect of Personal-Psychological Variables on the Relationship between Socioeconomic Status and Political Participation: A Structural Equations Framework, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 22, No. 4: 727-757.
- Cohen, B. C. (1963). *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Cohen, C. J., and Kahne. J. (2011). *Participatory Politics. New Media and Youth Political Action*. Oakland: YPP Research Network.
- Cohen, J. (1989). Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy, in Hamlin, A. and Petit, P. (eds). *The Good Polity*, Oxford: Blackwell.

- Cola, M. and Prario, B. (2012). New Ways of Consumption: The Audiences of Public Service Media in Italy and Switzerland. *Media, Culture and Society*, 34 (2): 181-194.
- Coleman, S. (2004). From Service to Commons: Re-inventing a Space for Public Communication, in D. Tambini and J. Cowling (eds) *From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Communications*. London: IPPR.
- Coleman, S., and Ross, K. (2010). *The Media and the Public: 'Them' and 'US' in media Discourse*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Collins, R., Curran, J., Garnham, N., Scannell, P., Schlesinger, P., and Sparks, C. (1986). *Media, Culture and Society: A Critical Reader*. London: Sage.
- Colombo, F. (ed.) (2004). *TV and Interactivity in Europe: Mythologies, Theoretical Perspectives, Real Experiences*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Conover, P. J., and Searing, D. D. (2005). Studying "Everyday Political Talk" in the Deliberative System. *Acta Politica*, 40: 269–283.
- Cornish, L., and Dunn, A. (2009). Creating Knowledge for Action: The Case for Participatory Communication in Research: *Development in Practice*, Volume 19, Numbers 4–5.
- Couchman, W., and Dawson, J. (1990). *Nursing and Health Care Research*, Scutari Press, London.
- Couldry, N. (2003). *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach*, London: Routledge.
- Couldry, N. (2009). Rethinking the Politics of Voice, *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* Vol. 23, No. 4, 579–582.
- Couldry, N. (2010). *Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics after Neoliberalism*: London: Sage.

- Couldry, N., Livingstone, S. and Markham, T. (2007). *Media Consumption and Public Engagement*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.1-16). London, UK.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Fourth ed. Lincoln: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. and Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124-131.
- Creswell, J. W. and Plano Clark, V.L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Crider, D. (2012). A Public Sphere in Decline: The State of Localism in Talk Radio, *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 56:2: 225-244.
- Crittenden, J. (1971). Democratic Functions of the Open Mike Radio Forum. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 35, 200– 210.
- Croteau, D. and Hoynes, W. (2000). *Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Pine Forge Press
- Croteau, D. and Hoynes, W. (2006). *The Business of Media. Corporate Media and the Public Interest*: London: Pine Forge Press
- Crotty, M. (2003): *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspectives in the Research Process*, 3rd edition London: Sage Publications.

- Curran, J. (1991). Rethinking the Media as a Public Sphere, in P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks (eds). *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Curran, J. (2000). Rethinking Media and Democracy, in J. Curran and M. Gurevitch, (eds). *Mass Media and Society*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Curran, J. (2002). *Media and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Curran, J. and Seaton, J. (2003). *Power Without Responsibility: The Press, Broadcasting, and New Media in Britain* (Sixth edition), Oxford: Routledge.
- Dahal, S., and Aram, I. A. (2013). Empowering Indigenous Community through Community Radio: A Case Study from Nepal. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(41), 1-26.
- Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1998). *On Democracy*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Dahlberg, L. (2005a). The Habermasian Public Sphere: Taking Difference Seriously?, *Theory and Society* 34(2): 111–36.
- Dahlberg, L. (2005b). The Corporate Colonization of Online Attention and the Marginalization of Critical Communication, *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 29(2): 160–80.
- Dahlberg, L. (2007). The Internet and Discursive Exclusion: From Deliberative to Agonistic Public Sphere Theory. In: Dahlberg L., Siapera E. (eds) *Radical Democracy and the Internet*. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Dahlberg, L. (2013). The Habermasian Public Sphere and Exclusion: An Engagement with Poststructuralist-Influenced Critics, *Communication Theory*, 24, 21–41.

- Dahlberg, L. (2014). The Habermasian Public Sphere: A Specification of the Idealized Conditions of Democratic Communication, *Studies in Social and Political Thought*, 1-18.
- Dahlgren, P. (1995). *Television and the Public Sphere: Citizenship, Democracy and the Media*. London: Sage.
- Dahlgren, P. (2000a). Media and Power Transitions in a Small Country: Sweden' in J. Curran and M. J. Park (eds) *De-Westernizing Media Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Dahlgren, P. (2000b). Media, Citizenship and Civic Culture: In J. Curran and M. Gurevitch (eds). *Mass Media and Society*, 3rd edition. London: Arnold.
- Dahlgren, P. (2002). In Search of the Talkative Public: Media, Deliberative Democracy and Civic Culture. *Javnost - The Public* 9 (3): 1–25.
- Dahlgren, P. (2006). Doing Citizenship. The cultural origins of civic agency in the public sphere, *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3): 267–286.
- Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and Political Engagement: Citizens, Communication, and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahlgren, P. (1991). An Introduction. In P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks (eds). *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere in the New Media Age*. London: Routledge.
- Dahlgren, P. and Sparks, C. (1991). *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Dalton, R. J. (2008). Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation, *Political Studies*: VOL 56: 76–98.
- Davies, R. (1993). *The Press and American Politics: The New Mediator*. New York: Longmans.

- Decrop, A. (1999). Triangulation in Qualitative Tourism Research; *Tourism Management* 20: 157-161.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., Cook, F. L., and Jacobs, L. R. (2004). Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 315–344.
- Delli Carpini, M.X. (2004). Mediating Democratic Engagement: The Impact of Communication on Citizens' Involvement in Political and Civic Life. In: Kaid, L.L. (Ed.) *Handbook of Political Communication Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Delli Carpini, M.X. and Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- deMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative Interview Studies: Learning Through Experience. In K. deMarrais and S. D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for Research: Methods of Inquiry in Education and Social Sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Denhardt, R. B., and Denhardt, J. V. (2003). *The New Public Service*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y. S. (2013). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deuze, M. (2006). Participation, Remediation, Bricolage: Considering Principal Components of a Digital Culture, *The Information Society: An International Journal*, vol. 22, No. 2: 63–75.
- Dewey, J. (1954). *The Public and its Problems*, Swallow Press, Athens, Ohio.
- Dietz, M., (1985). Citizenship with a Feminist Face: The Problem with Maternal Thinking. *Political Theory* 13 (1): 19-37.

- Dimitrova, D. V., Shehata, A., Strömbäck, J., and Nord, L. (2014). The Effects of Digital Media on Political Knowledge and Participation in Election Campaigns: Evidence from Panel Data. *Communication Research*, 41(1): 95-118.
- Doiste-Goulet, E. (2009). Social Networks and the Development of Political Interest. *Journal of Youth Studies* 12 (4): 405–421.
- Dow, J. K., (2009). Gender Differences in Political Knowledge: Distinguishing Characteristics Based and Returns-Based Differences, *Political Behaviour*, 31,117-136.
- Dreher, T. (2009). Listening Across Difference: Media and Multiculturalism beyond the Politics of Voice. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 23 (4): 445–458.
- Druckman, J. N. (2004). Political Preference Formation. *American Political Science Review*, 98: 671–686.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1990/1994). *Discursive Democracy: Politics, Policy, and Political Science*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2002). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edelman, M. (1988). *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Edström, M., Kenyon, A.T and Svensson, E. (2016). *Blurring the Lines: Market-Driven and Democracy-Driven Freedom of Expression*, Nordicom.
- Ekström, M., and Östman. J. (2013). Family Talk, Peer Talk and Young People's Civic Orientation. *European Journal of Communication* 28 (3): 294–308.
- Englund, T. (2006). Deliberative Communication: A Pragmatist Proposal, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol 38:5: 503-520.

- Enli, G. S. (2005). Fenomenet SMS-TV. Institusjonelle Strategier Og Semi-Privat interaksjon. *Norsk Medietidsskrift*.12(2): 116- 135.
- Enli, G. S. (2008). Redefining Public Services Broadcasting: Multi-Platform Participation. In *Convergence: The International Journal of research into New Media Technologies*. Vol. 14 (1): 105-120.
- Ercan, S. A. and Hendriks, C. M. (2013). The Democratic Challenges and Potential of Localism: Insights from Deliberative Democracy, *Policy Studies*, 34:4: 422-440.
- Eveland, W. P., and Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Connecting News Media Use with Gaps in Knowledge and Participation, *Political Communication*, 17: 3: 215-237.
- Eveland, W., Morey, A., and Hutchens, M. (2011). Beyond Deliberation: New Directions for the Study of Informal Political Conversation from a Communication Perspective. *Journal of Communication* 61: 1082–1103.
- Eveland, W.P. Jr. and Hutchens, M. (2008). Political Knowledge. In Donsbach, W. (Ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Eyben, R., Kabeer, N., and Cornwall, A. (2008). *Conceptualising Empowerment and the Implications for Pro Poor Growth: A Paper for the DAC Poverty Network: Report to DAC POVNET on Empowerment*. 21 September 2008.
- Farr, J. (1993). Framing Democratic Discussion', in Marcus, G. E. and Hanson, R. L. (1993). *Reconsidering the Democratic Citizen*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Feldman, O., and Kawakami, K. (1991). Media Use as Predictors of Political Behavior: The Case of Japan. *Political Psychology*, 12(1), 65–80.

- Fenton, N, and Barassi, V. (2011). Alternative Media and Social Networking Sites: The Politics of Individuation and Political Participation, *The Communication Review*, 14:3, 179-196.
- Ferree, M. M., Gamson, W. A., Gerhards, J. and Rucht, D. (2002a). Four Models of the Public Sphere in Modern Democracies, *Theory and Society*, Vol. 31, No. 3: 289-324.
- Ferree, M., Gamson, W., Gerhards, J., and Rucht, D. (2002b). *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Finkel, S. E. (1985). Reciprocal Effects of Participation and Political Efficacy: A Panel Analysis, *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 29, No. 4: 891-913.
- Fishkin, J. S. (2009). Virtual Public Consultation: Prospect for Internet Deliberative Democracy, in Davies, T. and Gangadharan, S. P. (eds), *Online Deliberation: Design, Research, and Practice* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Fizpatrick, B. (2019). *Validity in Qualitative Health Education Research*. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 11, 211-217.
- Flick, U., Kardorff, E., and Steinke, I. (2004). *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. London, England: Sage.
- Flynn, F. (2004). Communicative Power in Habermas's Theory of Democracy, *European Journal of Political Theory*. 3(4):433–454.
- Fraser, N., (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy, *Social Text*, No. 25/26: 56-80.
- Freund, J. ([1965] 1978). *L'essence du politique*. Paris: Editions S

- Fuchs, D. (2007). Participatory, Liberal and Electronic Democracy, in Zittel, T., and Fuchs, D. (2007). *Participatory Democracy and Political Participation. Can Participatory Engineering Bring Citizens Back in?* Routledge, London.
- Fung, A. (2002). Creating Deliberative Publics: Governance after Devolution and Democratic Centralism. *The Good Society* 11 (1): 66-71.
- Fung, A. (2003). Recipes for Public Spheres: Eight Institutional Design Choices and their Consequences, *Journal of Political Philosophy* 11: 338–367.
- Fung, A. (2004). *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fung, A., and Wright, E. O. (2001). Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance: *Politics and Society*, Vol. 29 No.1.
- Galston, W.A. (2001). Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 217–34.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking Politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (2001). Promoting Political Engagement, in W. L. Bennett and R. M. Entman (eds.), *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W. and Sasson, T. (1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 18, 373-393.
- Gamson, W. A., Modigliani, A. (1989). Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 95, No. 1. 1 37.
- García-Avilés, J. A., (2012). Roles of Audience Participation in Multiplatform Television: From Fans and Consumers, to Collaborators and Activists, *Journal of Audience and Reception Studies*, Vol 9, Issue 2: 429-447.

- Garnham, N. (1986). The Media and the Public Sphere, in P. Golding., G. Murdock, and P. Schlesinger. (eds.). *Communicating Politics – Mass Communication and the Political Process*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Garnham, N. (1990). (eds). *Capitalism and Communication, Global Culture and the Economics of Information*, Sage Publication, London.
- Garnham, N. (1993). Mass Media, Cultural Identity, and the Public Sphere in the Modern World. *Public Culture*, 5, 251-265.Press
- Garramone, G.M. and Atkin, C.K. (1986). Mass Communication and Political Socialization: Specifying The Effects, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 50: 76-86.
- Gastil, J. (2000). Is Face-to-Face Deliberation a Luxury or a Necessity, *Political Communication* 17: 357–361.
- Gastil, J. (2008). *Political Communication and Deliberation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gaventa, J. (2002). Introduction: *Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability*, *IDS Bulletin Vol 33 No. 2*.
- George, R. P., Kruger, E., and Tennant, M. (2012). Qualitative Research and Dental Public Health. *Indian Journal of Dental Research*, 23 (1), 92-96.
- Gerodimos, R., Scullion, R., Lilleker, D. G. and Jackson, D. (2013). Introduction to The Media, Political Participation and Empowerment, In R, Schullion., R, Gerodimos., D, Jackson, and D. G. Lilleker, (2013). *The Media, Political Participation and Empowerment*: London and New York. Routledge.
- Gerstl-Pepin, C. I. (2002). Media (Mis)Representations of Education in the 2000 Presidential Election. *Educational Policy*, 16,37-55.
- Gerstl-Pepin, C. I. (2007). Introduction to the Special Issue on the Media, Democracy, and the Politics of Education, *Peabody Journal of Education*, Vol. 82, No. 1, 1-9.

- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1999). The Constitution of Society: Outline of Theory of Structuration. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 21 (3): 85–99.
- Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociology*. Polity, Cambridge.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World Is Watching*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597-606.
- Graham, A. (2001). Quality Not Profit, *open Democracy*, 1: www.openDemocracy.net.
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V.J., and Graham, W. F. (1989). *Toward a Conceptual Framework for Mixed-Method Evaluation Designs Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 11, No. 3.
- Gripsrud, J. (2002). *Understanding Media Culture*. London: Arnold
- Gunther, R., Montero, J. R., and Wert K. I. (2000). The Media and Politics in Spain: From Dictatorship to Democracy. In R, Gunther, and A, Mughan, (eds.). *Democracy and the Media: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gurevitch, M. and Blumler. J. G. (1990). Political Communication Systems and Democratic Values. In J. Lichtenberg, (eds) *Democracy and the Mass Media*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gurevitch, M., and Levy, M. R. (1985). *Mass Communication Review Yearbook 5*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage.

- Gurevitch, M., Levy, M., and Roeh, I. (1991). The Global Newsroom: Convergences and Diversities in the Globalisation of Television News, in P. Dahlgren, and C. Sparks (eds). *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Gutmann, A., and Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement: Why Moral Conflict Cannot Be Avoided in Politics and What Can Be Done About It*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gutmann, A., and Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1962/1989/1991). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (1964). The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article. *New German Critique*, 3, 49–55.
- Habermas, J. (1997). The Public Sphere, in Goodin, R. E. and Pettit. P. (ed) *Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Oxford, UK Blackwell Publishers.
- Hackett, R. A. (2006). Is Peace Journalism Possible? Three Frameworks for Assessing Structure and Agency in News Media. *Conflict and Communication Online*, 5(2).
- Hagemann, C. (2002). Participation in and Contents of Two Dutch Political Party Discussion Lists on the Internet, Javnost - *The Public: Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture*, 9:2, 61-76.
- Hagen, L. (1993). Opportune Witnesses: An Analysis of Balance in the Selection of Sources and Arguments in the Leading German Newspapers' Coverage of the Census Issue. *European Journal of Communication*, 8, 317–343.

- Hall, S. (1977). Culture, The Media and The “Ideological Effect” in J. Curran, M. Gurevitch and J. Woollacott (eds) *Mass Communication and Society*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Hameso, S. (1995). Politics of Freedom of Information in Africa, in *Focus on International and Comparative Librarianship*. Vol. 26, No. 3. 156-164.
- Harrison, J. (2006). *News*. London: Routledge.
- Hart, S. (2009). The ‘Problem’ With Youth: Young People, Citizenship and The Community. *Citizenship Studies*, 13(6): 641-657.
- Hartley, J. (2010). Silly Citizenship. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(4): 233-248.
- Hass, T. (2004). The Public Sphere as a Sphere of Publics: Rethinking Habermas’s Theory of Public Sphere”: *In International Communication*, 2004: 54: 178-184.
- Heath, A., Andersen, R. and Sinnott, R. (2002). Do Less Informed Voters Make Mistakes? Political Knowledge and Electoral Choice, *CREST, Working Paper 97, September*.
- Held, D. (2006). *Models of Democracy*, 3rd edition. Polity Press: Cambridge.
- Heller, P. (2009). Democratic Deepening in India and South Africa. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 44 (1): 123–149.
- Henning, C. and Renblad, K. (2009). Perspectives on Empowerment, Social Cohesion and Democracy: *An international anthology*. School of Health Sciences. Jönköping University,
- Herbst, S. (1995). On Electronic Public Space: Talk Shows in Theoretical Perspective. *Political Communication*, 12, 263–274.
- Higgins, J. W. (1999). Citizenship and Empowerment: A Remedy for Citizen Participation in Health Reform, *Community Development Journal* VOL. 34 NO. 4 287-307.

- Hill, K.A. and Hughes, J.E. (1998). *Cyberpolitics: Citizen Activism in the Age of the Internet*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hilmer, J. D. (2010). The State of Participatory Democratic Theory, *New Political Science*, 32 (1): 43-63.
- Hoffman, L. H., and Thompson, T. L. (2009). The Effect of Television Viewing on Adolescents' Civic Participation: Political Efficacy as a Mediating Mechanism. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 53: 3–21.
- Hoffstetter, C. R., Donovan, M. C., Klauber, M. R., Cole, A., Huie, C. J., and Yuasa, T. (1994). Political Talk Radio: A Stereotype Reconsidered. *Political Research Quarterly*, 47, 467–479.
- Hofstetter, C. R. (1998). Political Talk Radio, Situational Involvement, and Political Mobilization. *Social Science Quarterly* 79 (2).
- Hofstetter, C. R., Barker, D., Smith, J. T. Zari, G.M and Ingrassia, T. A. (1999). Information, Misinformation, and Political Talk Radio, *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 52, No. 2.
- Horwitz, R. B. (2001). *Communication and Democratic Reform in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huckfeldt, R., and Sprague, J. (1995). *Citizens, Politics and Social Communication: Information and Influence in an Election campaign*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hungbo, J. (2013). Audience Empowerment and the Politics of Representation in Two Talk Shows in Post-Apartheid South Africa: In R, Schullion., R, Gerodimos., D, Jackson, and D. G. Lilleker, (2013). *The Media, Political Participation and Empowerment*: London and New York. Routledge.

- Hutchby, I. (1996). *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, Asymmetries, and Power on Talk Radio*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Iosifidis, P. (2010). *Reinventing Public Service Communication*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Iosifidis, P. (2011). The Public Sphere, Social Networks and Public Service Media. *Information, Communication and Society* 14 (5): 619–637.
- Irvin, R. A. and Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 64, No. 1:55-65.
- Jackson, D., Scullion, R. and Molesworth, M. (2013). 'Ooh, politics. You're Brave.' Politics in Everyday Talk: An Analysis of Three 'Non-Political' Online Spaces, In R, Schullion., R, Gerodimos., D, Jackson, and D. G. Lilleker, (2013). *The Media, Political Participation and Empowerment*: London and New York. Routledge.
- Jacobs, L R., Cook, F. L., and Delli Carpini, M. X. (2009). *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Javan, J. (1998). Empowerment for Community Development: A Multivariate Framework for Assessing Empowerment at the Community Level. *Department of Psychology*, North Carolina state University.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*, New York University Press, New York.
- Johnson, B. R. and Onwuegbuzie, A. J., (2004). Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 33, No. 7.
- Johnson, P. (2004). Black Radio Politically Defined: Communicating Community and Political Empowerment Stevie Wonder's KJLMH-FM, 1992-2002: *In Political Communication*, 21:353-367.

- Jung, K., Kim, Y. and de Zuniga, H.G. (2011). The Mediating Role of Knowledge and Efficacy in the Effects of Communication on Political Participation. *Mass Communication and Society*, 14:4: 407–30.
- Jung, N., Kim, Y., and Gil de Zúñiga, H., (2011). The Mediating Role of Knowledge and Efficacy in the Effects of Communication on Political Participation, *Mass Communication and Society*, 14:4, 407-430.
- Kahan, M. (1999). *Media as Politics: Theory, Behaviour, and Change in America*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kaid, L. L., McKinney, M. S., and Tedesco, J. C. (2007). Political Information Efficacy and Young Voters. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(9): 1093-1111.
- Karppinen, K. (2007). Against Naïve Pluralism in Media Politics: On the Implications of the Radical-Pluralist Approach to the Public Sphere, *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 29(3): 495–508.
- Karppinen, K., Moe, H., and Svensson, J. (2008). Habermas, Mouffe and Political Communication, *Javnost - The Public*, 15:3, 5-21.
- Katz, E. (1992). On Parenting a Paradigm: Gabriel Tarde's Agenda for Opinion and Communication Research. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 4: 80–85.
- Kaufman, A. (1960). Human Nature and Participatory Democracy. In Friedrich, C. (ed.), *Responsibility: NOMOS III*. New York: Liberal Arts Press.
- Keane, J. (1992). Democracy and the Media – Without Foundations, *Political Studies*, XL: Special Issue, 116–27.
- Keane, J. (1995). Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere. *The Communication Review*, 1(1): 1–22.
- Kellner, D. (1990). *Television and the Crisis of Democracy*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Kellner, D., (2004). *Cultural Marxism and cultural studies* [Cited 15 April 2019]. Available at: <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/papers/cultmarx.htm>.
- Kenski, K., and Stroud, N. J. (2006). Connections Between Internet Use and Political Efficacy, Knowledge, and Participation. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 50: 173–192.
- Kepplinger, H. M. (1989). Instrumentelle Aktualisierung: Grundlagen einer Theorie Publizistischer Konflikte. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 30, 199–220.
- Kieffer, C. (1984). Citizen Empowerment: A Developmental Perspective. *Prevention in Human Services*, 3: 9-36.
- Kim, J. and Kim, E. J. (2008). Theorizing Dialogic Deliberation: Everyday Political Talk as Communicative Action and Dialogue, *Communication Theory* (18): 51–70.
- Kim, J., Wyatt, R. Oand Katz, E., (1999). News, Talk, Opinion, Participation: The Part Played by Conversation in Deliberative Democracy, *Political Communication*, 16:4, 361-385.
- King, N. (2004). Using Templates in the Thematic Analysis of Text. In Cassell, C. and Symon, G. (Eds.), *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*. London, UK: Sage.
- King, S. K., Feltey, K. M., and Susel, B. O. (1998). The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4): 317-326.
- Kirsch, G. E. (1999). *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research: The Politics of Location, Interpretation, and Publication*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kluge, A. (1981–2). On Film and the Public Sphere. *New German Critique*, 24/ 25: 206–20.

- Knight, J. and Johnson, J. (1997). What Sort of Political Equality Does Deliberative Democracy Require? In Bohman, J. and Rehg, W. (eds), *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kort, W and Gharbi, J. E., (2013). Structuration Theory Amid Negative and Positive Criticism, *International Journal of Business and Social Research (IJBSR)*, Volume -3, No.-5.
- Kotze, H. J. (1986). Mass Media and Political Socialization: A South African Case Study. *International Political Science Review*, 7: 415-434.
- Kupe, T. (2006). The Gap Between Values and Practice. In *Rhodes Journalism Review*. 26 September 2006.
- Lamprianou, I. (2013). Contemporary Political Participation Research: A Critical Assessment. In K. N. Demetriou, (ed.), *Democracy in Transition. Political Participation in the European Union*. Berlin, Heidelberg, Springer- Verlag, 21-42.
- Lang, G. E., and Lang, K. (1983). *The Battle for Public Opinion: The President, the Press, and the Polls During Watergate*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Lang, K., and Lang, G. E. (1966). The Mass Media and Voting. In B. Berelson and M. Janowitz (Eds.), *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press
- Larsen, H., (2011). Public Service Broadcasting as an Object for Cultural Policy in Norway and Sweden. *A Policy Tool and an End in Itself, Nordicom Review* (32) 2,35-47.
- Lasch, C. (1990). Journalism, Publicity and the Lost art of Argument. *Gannett Center Journal*, 4{2}: 1-11.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1941). *Democracy through Public Opinion*. New York: Bantam.
- Layder, D. (1994/2006). *Understanding Social Theory*. Sage Publications, London.

- Lee, F. L. F. (2007). Talk Radio Listening, Opinion Expression and Political Discussion in a Democratizing Society, *Asian Journal of Communication*, 17:1, 78-96.
- Lee, G. and Capella, J. N. (2001). The Effects of Political Talk Radio on Political Attitude Formation: Exposure versus Knowledge, *Political Communication* 18(4): 369–94.
- Leedy, P.D. and Ormrod, J.E. (2013). *Practical Research Planning and Design*. 10th Edition, Merrill/Prentice Hall, Boston.
- Lefort, C. (1986). *Essais sur la politique, XIX-XX siecles*. Paris: E
- Leininger, M. M. (1985). Ethnography and Ethnonursing: Models and Modes of Qualitative Data Dnalysis. In M. M. Leininger (Ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Nursing Orlando*, FL: Grune and Stratton.
- Leurdijk, A. (1997). Common Sense versus Political Discourse: Debating Racism and Multicultural Society in Dutch Talk Shows. *European Journal of Communication*, 12: 147-168.
- Leurdijk, A. (2007). Public Service Media Dilemmas and Regulation in a Converging Media Landscape, in Lowe, G. F. and Bardoel, J (eds.). (2007). *From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media*, Nordicom.
- Lindlof, T., and Taylor, B. (2002). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public Opinion*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Lister, R. (1998). Citizen in Action: Citizenship and Community Development in Northern Ireland Context, *Community Development Journal*, Vol 33 No 3: 226–35.
- Livingstone, S., and Lunt, P. (1994). *Talk on Television: Audience Participation and Public Debate*. London: Routledge.

- Lye J. (1997). *Structuration Theory and Organizations*. Available at: <http://www.brocku.ca/commstudies/courses/2F50/structuration.html> [accessed 14 April 2003].
- Macgilchrist, F. (2013). Is 'Empowerment' Still a Useful Concept? Rethinking Media Practice with Ranciere and the 'Emancipated Spectator', in Schullion, R., Gerodimos, R., Jackson, D., and Lilleker, D. G. (2013). *The Media, Political Participation and Empowerment*: London and New York. Routledge.
- Macnamara, J. (2005). Media Content Analysis: Its Uses, Benefits and Best Practice Methodology. *Asia Pacific Public Relations Journal*, 6 (1), 1– 34.
- Macpherson C. B. (1977). *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Malila, V., Oelofsen, M., Garman A. and Wasserman H. (2013). Making Meaning of Citizenship: How 'Born Frees' Use Media in South Africa's Democratic Evolution, *Communicatio*, 39:4:415-431.
- Mamdani, M., (1992) Africa: Democratic Theory and Democratic Struggles: *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 27, No. 41 pp. 2228-2232
- Manoff, R. K. (1987). Writing the News (By Telling the "Story"). In R. K. Manoff and M. Schudson, *Reading the News* (ed). New York: Pantheon.
- Marshall, C., and Rossman, G. B. (1995). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, London. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Masmoudi, M. (1992). Media and the State in Periods of Crisis. In M. Raboy, and B. Dagenais (eds). (1992). *Media, Crisis and Democracy: Mass Communication and the Disruption of Social Order*. London: Sage.
- Mason, R. (1982). *Participatory and Workplace Democracy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- McAllister, I. (1998). Civic Education and Political Knowledge in Australia, *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 33 (2), 7–23.
- McChesney R, W. (1997). The Mythology of Commercial Broadcasting and the Contemporary Crisis of Public Broadcasting, *The 1997 Spry Memorial Lecture; Montreal*, 2 December 1997 / Vancouver, 4 December 1997.
- McChesney, R. W. (1998). The Political Economy of Global Communication, in R.W. McChesney., E.M. Wood, and J. B. Foster, (eds). *Capitalism and the Information Age: The Political Economy of the Global Communication Revolution*. New York, Monthly Review Press.
- McChesney, R. W. (1999). *Rich Media, Poor Democracy: Communication Politics in Dubious Times*, Urbana/Champagne, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- McCombs, M. and Shaw, D. (1972). The Agenda Setting Function of Mass Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36: 176-187.
- McEwan, C. (2005). New Spaces of Citizenship? Rethinking Gendered Participation and Empowerment in South Africa. *Political Geography*, 24 (8).969-991.
- McIntosh, H., Hart, D., and Youniss, J. (2007). The Influence of Family Political Discussion on Youth Civic Development: Which Parent Qualities Matter? *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 40 (3): 495 499.
- McLeod, J. M., Scheufele, D. A., and Moy, P. (1999). Community, Communication, and Participation: The Role of Mass Media and Interpersonal Discussion in Local Political Participation. *Political Communication*, 16: 315–336.
- McNair, B. (2011). *An Introduction to Political Communication* Fifth edition: London and New York: Routledge.

- McNair, B., Hibberd, M., and Schlesinger, P. (2002). Public Access Broadcasting and Democratic Participation in the Age of Mediated Politics, *Journalism Studies*, 3:3: 407-422.
- Mcquail, D. (2005). *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory* (fifth edition): Sage, London.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *On Social Psychology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Melody, W. H. (1990). Communication Policy in the Global Information Economy: Whither the Public Interest? In M. Ferguson. (1990). *Public Communication: The New Imperatives*: London. SAGE Publications.
- Memoli, V. (2011). How Does Political Knowledge Shape Support for Democracy? Some Research Based on the Italian Case, *Bulletin of Italian Politics Vol. 3*, No. 1, 2011: 79-102.
- Mendelberg, T. (2002). The Deliberative Citizen: Theory and Evidence. *Political Decision Making, Deliberation and Political Participation*. Vol 6. 151-193.
- Merriam, S. B., and Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mhlanga, B. (2016). The Return of the Local: Community Radio as Dialogic and Participatory. In A. Salawu, and M. B. Chibita, (2016). *Indigenous Language Media, Language Politics and Democracy in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Michels, A. and De Graaf, L. (2010). Examining Citizen Participation: Local Participatory Policy Making and Democracy, *Local Government Studies*, 36:4, 477-491.
- Michels, A. M. B. (2006). Citizen Participation and Democracy in the Netherlands, *Democratization*, 13:02, 323-339.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA Sage Publications.
- Mills, J., Bonner, A., and Francis, K. (2006). Adopting a Constructivist Approach to Grounded Theory: Implications for Research Design. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 12(1): 8-13.
- Milton, V. C., Wasserman, H. and Garman, A. (2013). Media, Citizenship and the Politics of Belonging in Contemporary South Africa, *Communicatio*, 39:4, 405-414.
- Moe, H. (2008). Dissemination and Dialogue in the Public Sphere: A Case for Public Service Media Online, *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 30(3): 319–336.
- Moeller, J. and de Vreese, C. (2015). Spiral of Political Learning: The Reciprocal Relationship of News Media Use and Political Knowledge Among Adolescents. *Communication Research*: 1–17.
- Mogekwu, M. (2002). Mass Media and the New Partnership for Africa's Development: Realities and Challenges, *Inaugural Lecture Delivered* on May 14, 2002 at the University of North West, Mmabatho.
- Moon, J. D. (1972). Participation and Democracy: A Review Essay Midwest, *Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 16, No. 3: 473-485.
- Morrell, M. E. (2003). Survey and Experimental Evidence for a Reliable and Valid Measure of Internal Political Efficacy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67:4, 589–602.
- Morrell, M. E. (2005). Deliberation, Democratic Decision Making and Internal Political Efficacy. *Political Behaviour*, 27: 49–69.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue*, Revised edn. Sage, Newbury Park.
- Mosco, V. (2009). *The Political Economy of Communication*. 2ed Sage Publication, London.

- Mouffe, C. (1999). Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism? *Social Research* 66.3. 745-758.
- Moy, P., Xenos, M. A., and Hess, V. K. (2005). Communication and Citizenship: Mapping the Political Effects of Infotainment. *Mass Communication and Society*, 8, 111–131.
- Mpofu, D. (2006). Striving to Serve the Entire Population. In *Rhodes Journalism Review*.
- Müller, L. (2010). Can Mass Media Mobilize and Empower Voters in Elections? A Multi-Level Analysis of Established Democracies: *Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Swiss Political Science Association, Geneva 7 – 8 January 2010*.
- Murdoch, G. (1982). Large Corporations and the Control of the Communication Industries. In Gurevitch, M et al. (eds.) *Culture, Society and the Media*. London: Routledge.
- Murdock, G and Golding, P. (1989). Information Poverty and Political Inequality: Citizenship in the Age of Privatised Communication. *Journal of Communication*, Vol 39, No 2.
- Murdock, G. (1992). Citizens, Consumers, and Public Culture' in M. Skovmand and K. Schroder (eds) *Media Cultures*, London: Routledge.
- Murdock, G. (1999). Rights and Representations: Public Discourse and Cultural Citizenship. In: J. Gripsrud (Ed) *Television and Common Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Murdock, G. (2000). Talk Shows: Democratic Debates and Tabloid Tales' in J. Wieten, G. Murdock and P. Dahlgren (eds) *Television Across Europe*, London: Sage.

- Murdock, G., and Golding, P. (2005). Culture, Communications and Political Economy:
In J. Curran, and M. Gurevitch, (2005). *Mass Media and Society*. 4th Edition.
London. Hodder Arnold.
- Murphy, P. D. (2007). Media and Democracy in the Age of Globalisation. In I. D. Blankson,
and P. D. Murphy, (2007). *Negotiating Democracy: Media Transformation in
Emerging Democracies*, Albany: Suny Press.
- Mustapha, R. (2012a) Introduction; The 'Missing' Concept: What is the 'Public Sphere'
Good for? *Africa Development*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1
- Mustapha, R. (2012b). The Public Sphere in 21st Century Africa: Broadening the
Horizons of Democratisation. *Africa Development*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1
- Muthukumaraswamy, K. (2010). When the Media Meet Crowds of Wisdom: How
Journalists are tapping in Audience Expertise and Manpower for the Process of
Newsgathering. *Journalism Practice*, 4 (1): 48-65.
- Mutz, D. C. (2006). *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mutz, D. C., and Martin, P. S. (2001). Facilitating Communication Across Lines of Political
Difference: The Role of Mass Media. *American Political Science Review* 95: 97–
114.
- Mwesige, P. G. (2009). The Democratic Functions and Dysfunctions of Political Talk
Radio: The Case of Uganda. *Journal of African Media Studies*, 1(2): 221-245.
- Nelson, N. and Wright. S. (1995). *Power and Participatory Development: Theory and
Practice*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications. Nylen.
- Neuman, W. (1997). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*.
Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon

- Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approach* 3rd ed: Allyn and Bacon: Viacom Company.
- Newcomb, H., and Hirsch, P. (1983). Television as a Cultural Forum: Implication for Research; *Quarterly Review of film studies*, 8 (1).
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The Spiral of Silence*, (2nd Edition). Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- Nordenstreng, K. (2000). Media and Democracy: What is Really Required? In J. van Cuilenburg and R. van der Wurff (eds.), *Media and Open Societies: Cultural, Economic and Policy Foundations for Media Openness and Diversity in East and West*, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Nyamnjoh, F. B. (2005). *Africa's Media, Democracy and the Politics of Belonging* (London: Zed Books).
- O' Shaughnessy, M. and Stadler, J., (2005). *Media and Society: An Introduction*; 3th Edition. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Odhiambo, C. J. (2011). From Diffusion to Dialogic Space: FM Radio Stations in Kenya in L. Gunner., D. Ligaga, and D. Moyo. (eds.) *The 'Public Sphere' in Radio in Africa: Politics, Culture, Communities*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Omwoha, J. (2010). Talk Radio *Jambo Kenya* as a Public Sphere for Deliberative Democracy. *Kenya Studies Review*: 3, 3, 41-56.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., and Collins, K. M. (2007). A Typology of Mixed Methods Sampling Designs in Social Science Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2): 281-316.
- Page, B.I. (1996). *Who deliberates? Mass Media in Modern Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pan, Z. and Kosicki, G. M. (1997). TalkShow Exposure as an Opinion Activity, *Political Communication*, 14:3, 371-388.

- Parkins, P. R., and Mitchell, R. E. (2005). Public Participation as Public Debate: A Deliberative Turn in Natural Resource Management, *Society and Natural Resources*, 18:6: 529-540.
- Parpart, J.L., Rai, S.M., and Staudt, K. (2003). *Rethinking Empowerment: Gender and Development in a Global/Local World*. New York: Routledge. Peterson.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge University Press: London and New York.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Perkins, D. D., and Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Empowerment Theory, Research and Application. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23: 569–578.
- Peters, B. (2001). Deliberative Öffentlichkeit. In L. Wingert, and K. Günther, (Eds.), *Die Öffentlichkeit der Vernunft und die Vernunft der Öffentlichkeit* (655–677). Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Peters, B. (2005). Public Discourse, Identity, and the Problem of Democratic Legitimacy. In E. O. Eriksen (Ed.), *Making the European Polity: Reflexive integration in the EU*. London: Routledge.
- Pinderhughes, E.B. (1983). Empowerment for Our Clients and for Ourselves, *Social Casework*, 63: 331-338.
- Pinkleton, B. E. Austin, E. W., and Fortman, K. K. J. (1998). Relationships of Media Use and Political Disaffection to Political Efficacy and Voting Behaviour, *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 42:1, 34-49.

- Price, V., Cappella, J. N. and Nir, L. (2002). Does Disagreement Contribute to More Deliberative Opinion? *Political Communication*, 19:1, 95-112.
- Print, M. (2007). Citizenship Education and Youth Participation in Democracy, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol.55, no.3. 325-345.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of Empowerment/Exemplars of Prevention: Towards a Theory of Community Psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 15: 121-147.
- Rappaport, J., and Seidman, E. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of Community Psychology*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Reese, S. (1990). The News Paradigm and The Ideology of Objectivity: A Socialist at the *Wall Street Journal*. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*. 7. 390-409.
- Reid, A. J. (1996). What We Want: Qualitative Research. Promising Frontier for Family Medicine. *Can Fam Physician*. 42: 387-9, 397-400.
- Renblad, K. (2003). *Empowerment. A Question about Democracy and Ethics in Everyday Life*. Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
- Ritzer, G. (2008). *Modern Sociological Theory*. International Edition: McGraw-Hill.
- Robins, S., Cornwall, A., and von Lieres, B. (2008). Rethinking 'Citizenship' in the Postcolony. *Third World Quarterly* 29(6), 1069–1086.
- Robinson, S. (2011). Journalism as Process: The Labour Implications of Participatory Content in News Organization, *Journalism and Communication Monographs*, vol. 13, no. 3: 138–210.

- Rodny-Gumede, Y. (2015). Re-conceptualising the Analysis of Trajectories of Media Development in Post-Colonial Societies. *Journal of Global Media and Communication* 11 (2): 131–146.
- Rojas, H., Shah, D., Cho, J., Schmierbach, M., Keum, H., and Gil-De-Zuniga, H. (2005). Media Dialogue: Perceiving and Addressing Community Problems. *Mass Communication and Society*, 8: 93–110.
- Rose, L. E. and Pettersen, P. A. (1999). Confidence in Politicians and Institutions: in Narud, H, M. and Aalberg, T. (eds) *Challenges to Representative Democracy: Parties, Voters and Public Opinion*. Bergen Fagbokforlaget.
- Rosenstone, S. J., and Hansen, J. M. (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Ross, K. (2004). Political Talk Radio and Democratic Participation: Caller Perspectives on Election Call, *Media Culture Society*, 26: 785.
- Rubin, A. M. and Step, M. M. (2000). Impact of Motivation, Attraction, and Parasocial Interaction on Talk Radio listening, *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 44:4, 635-654.
- Sabir, M. (2013). Public Media and Multicultural Globe, *South Asian Studies* Vol. 28, No. 1, 223-239.
- Salawu, A. (2016). Indigenous Language Media and Democracy in Africa. In A, Salawu, and M. B., Chibita, (eds). *Indigenous Language Media, Language Politics and Democracy in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salawu, A. S. (2004). Identity Politics and the Indigenous Language Press: A Case Study of the Alaroye Publications. In Duro Oni et al. (ed.) *Nigeria and Globalisation: Discourses on Identity Politics and Social Conflict*. Lagos: CBAAC.

- Salawu, A., and Chibita, M. B. (2016). *Indigenous Language Media, Language Politics and Democracy in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sale, J. E. M., Lohfeld, L. H., and Brazil, K., (2002). Revisiting the Quantitative-Qualitative Debate: Implications for Mixed-Methods Research, *Quality and Quantity* 36: 43–53.
- Samah A. A. and Aref, F. (2009). Empowerment as an Approach for Community Development in Malaysia, *World Rural Observations* 1(2):63-68.
- Santos, B. d. S. (2012). Public Sphere and Epistemologies of the South, *Africa Development*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social Research Second Edition*: Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Publishers LTD.
- Sartori, G. (1987). *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*. New York: Steven Bridges Press.
- Sassi. S. (2001). Public Opinion as Local Opinion. In S. Splichal (ed.). *Public Opinion and Democracy*. Creskill. NJ: Hampton Press.
- Savigny, H. (2013). Media, Politics and Empowerment: In R, Schullion., R, Gerodimos., D, Jackson, and D. G. Lilleker, (2013). *The Media, Political Participation and Empowerment*: London and New York. Routledge.
- Scannel, P. (1990). Public Service Broadcasting: The History of the Concept: In A. Goodwin, and G. Whannel, (ed) *Understanding Television*: Routledge. London.
- Scannell, P. (1992). Public Service Broadcasting and Modern Public Life' in P. Scannell, P. Schlesinger and C. Sparks (eds) *Culture and Power*, London: Sage.
- Scannell, P. (2005). The Meaning of Broadcasting in the Digital Era ', in G.F. Lowe, and P. Jauert (ed), *Cultural Dilemmas in Public Service Broadcasting*, Goteborg: Nordicom.

- Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication, *Mass Communication and Society*, 3:2-3, 297-316.
- Scheufele, D. A. (2002). Examining Differential Gains from Mass Media and their Implications for Participatory Behaviour. *Communication Research*, 29: 46–65.
- Schlozman, K. L., Verba, S., and Brady, H. E. (2012). *The Unheavenly Chorus: Unequal Political Voice and The Broken Promise of American Democracy*. Princeton: NJ Princeton University Press.
- Schudson, M. (1992). Was There Ever a Public Sphere? If So, When? Reflections on The American Case, In: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press: 143-163.
- Schudson, M. (1997). Why Conversation is Not the Soul of Democracy, *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 14 (4): 297–309.
- Semetko, H. A., and Valkenburg, P. M. (1998). The Impact of Attentiveness on Political Efficacy: Evidence from a Three-Year German Panel Study. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 10: 195–210.
- Siapera, E. (2004). From Couch Potatoes to Cybernauts? *The Expanding Notion of the Audience on TV Channels' Websites*, *New Media and Society*, 6 (2): 155-172.
- Singh, E. (2015). Participatory Democracy: A Conceptual Engagement, *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 4(9), 5-8.
- Sirianni, C., and Friedland, L. (2001). *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Smith, G. and Wales, C. (2000). Citizens' Juries and Deliberative Democracy, *Political Studies* 48. 51-65.

- Smythe, W. E. and Murray, M. J. (2000). Owning the Story: Ethical Considerations in Narrative Research. *Ethics and Behaviour*, 10, 311-336.
- Soroka, S., Andrew, B., Aalberg, T., Iyengar, S., Curran, J. Coen, S., Hayashi, K, Jones, P., Mussolini, G. Rhee, W. J., Rowe, D. and Tiffen, D. (2012). Auntie Knows Best? Public Broadcasters and Current Affairs Knowledge. *British Journal of Political Science*, 43, 719–739.
- Sotirovic, M. and Mcleod, J. (2001). Values, Communication Behaviour, and Political Participation. *Political Communication*. 18. 273-300.
- Sotirovic, M., and McLeod, J. M. (2004). Knowledge as Understanding: The Information Processing Approach to Political Learning. In L. L. Kaid, (Ed.). *Political Communication Research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC), Television Division. (1996). *Guidelines for programme content*. Johannesburg: SABC.
- Sparks, C. (1998). *Communism, Capitalism and the Mass Media*. London: Sage
- Sparks, H. (1997). Dissident Citizenship: Democratic Theory, Political Courage, and Activist Women, *Hypatia*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 74-110.
- Squires, C. R. (2000). Black Talk Radio: Defining Community Needs and Identity. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*; 5 (2):73–95.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Staples, L. (1990). Powerful Ideas About Empowerment. *Administration in Social Work*, 14(2), 29-42.
- Stein, L. (1998). Democratic “Talk,” Access Television and Participatory Political Communication, *Javnost - The Public: Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture*, 5(2): 21-34.

- Stevenson, N. (1993-1994). Habermas, Mass Culture and the Future of the Public Sphere, *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 3. 221-245.
- Stiegler, B. (2009). Teleologies of the Snail: The Errant Self wired to a WiMax Network. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 26 (2–3), 33–45.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1955). *Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties: A Cross-Section of the Nation Speaks its Mind*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Strandberg, K. (2015). Designing for Democracy? An Experimental Study Comparing the Outcomes of Citizen Discussions in Online Forums with Those of Online Discussions in a Forum Designed According to Deliberative Principles. *European Political Science Review*, 7: 451-474.
- Strömbäck, J. (2005). In Search of a Standard: Four Models of Democracy and Their Normative Implications for Journalism, *Journalism Studies*, 6 (3): 331-345.
- Syvvertsen, T. (1999). The Many Uses of the “Public Service” Concept, *Nordicom Review* 20 (1): 5-12.
- Tambini, D. (1999). New Media and Democracy: The Civic Networking Movement, *New Media and Society*, 1 (3): 305-29.
- Teer-Tomaselli, R. E, and Tomaselli, K.G. (1994). Reconstituting Public Service Broadcasting: Media and Democracy During Transition in South Africa Communicare: *Journal for Communication Sciences in Southern Africa*, Volume 13, Issue 2.
- Teer-Tomaselli, R. E. (1998). The Public Broadcaster and Democracy in Transformation: The 1996 Spry Memorial Lecture, *Canadian Journal of Communication* 23 (2).

- Tettey, W. J. (2011). Talk Radio and Politics in Ghana: Exploring Civic and (un)Civic Discourses, in L. Gunner., D. Ligaga, and D. Moyo. (eds.) *The 'Public Sphere' in Radio in Africa: Politics, Culture, Communities*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Thomas, J. C. (1995). *Public Participation in Public Decisions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Thomass, B., (2003). Knowledge Society and Public Sphere. Two Concepts for the Remit. in F. G. Lowe, and T. Hujanen, (eds.) *Broadcasting and Convergence: New Articulations of the Public Service Remit*, Nordicom
- Thompson, J. B. (1993). The Theory of the Public Sphere. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 10, 173-189.
- Tilley, J., Sturgis, P. and Allum, N. (2004). "Political Information and Motivation: A Case of Reciprocal Causality?" *Paper Presented at Symposium on "Perceptions Preferences and Rationalization: Overcoming the Problem of Causal Inference in the Study of Political Behaviour"* Nuffield College, Oxford, 7-8 May.
- Tina, N. (2010). Deliberative Democracy and Citizenship: In Search of the Efficacy Effect, *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 6: Iss. 2, Article 8.
- Tuchman, G. (1978a). *Making News*. New York: Free Press.
- Tuchman, G. (1978b). Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity. *American Sociology Review*, 77, 660-679
- Turner, B. S. (1994). Postmodern Culture/Modern Citizens, in B. van Steenberg (ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage.
- Turner, J. (1990). *Anthony Giddens, Consensus and Controversy*, in (eds J. Modgil and C. Modgil). Falmer, Basingstoke.

- US-AID (1999). *The Role of Media in Democracy: A Strategic Approach*, Technical Publications Series, Center for Democracy and Governance, Washington DC: US-AID.
- van Dijck, J. (2009). Users like you? Theorising Agency in User-Generated Content, *Media, Culture and Society*, 31(1), 41-58.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Vaughan, B. (2001). Handle with Care: On the Use of Structuration Theory Within Criminology. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41, 185–200.
- Verba, S. (1967). Democratic Participation, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Volume 2. 53-78.
- Verba, S., Nie, N. H., and Kim, J. (1971). *The Modes of Democratic Participation. A Cross-National Comparison*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., and Brady, H. (1995). *Voice and Equality. Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Voltmer, K. (2000): Structure of Diversity of Press and Broadcasting Systems: The Institutional Context of Public Communications in Western Democracies. *WZB Discussion Paper FS III 00-201*. Berlin.
- Vreese, C.H. and Semetko, H. A. (2004). *Political Campaigning in Referendums: Framing the Referendum Issue*. London: Routledge.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2008). On the Public Sphere, Deliberation, Journalism and Dignity. *Journalism Studies*, 9: 6, 962-970.
- Warren, M. E. (1992). Democratic Theory and Self-Transformation, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 86, No. 1.

- Warren, M. E. (1993). Can Participatory Democracy Produce Better Selves? Psychological Dimensions of Habermas's Discursive Model of Democracy, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 14, No. 2.
- Warren, M. E. (1996). What Should We Expect from More Democracy? Radically Democratic Responses to Politics, *Political Theory*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 241-270.
- Wasserman, H. (2011). Mobile Phones, Popular Media and Everyday African Democracy: Transmissions and Transgressions, *Popular Communication*, 9 (2): 146-58.
- Wasserman, H. and Garman, A. (2013). Being South African and Belonging: The Status and Practice of Mediated Citizenship in a New Democracy. In N. W Jones (2013). *Diversity and Turbulence in Contemporary Global Migration*. Inter-Disciplinary Press. Oxford, United Kingdom
- Wasserman, H., and Garman, A. (2014). The Meanings of Citizenship: Media Use and Democracy in South Africa, *Social Dynamics*, 40:2.
- Webster, J. G. (2009). The Role of Structure in Media Choice. In T. Hartmann and P. Vorderer (ed) *Media Choice: A Theoretical and Empirical Overview*, Routledge: New York.
- Wendy, W. (2011). At the Crossroads of the Formal and Popular: Convergence Culture and New Publics in Zimbabwe. in H. Wasserman, (2011). *Popular Media, Democracy and Development in Africa*, Routledge, London.
- Wessler, H. (2008). Investigating Deliberativeness Comparatively, *Political Communication*, 25:1, 1-22.
- Whittington, R. (2015). Giddens, Structuration Theory and Strategy as Practice. In D. Golsorkhi., L. Rouleau, D. Seidl, and E. Vaara (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Wilhelm, A. G. (1998). Virtual Sounding Boards: How Deliberative is On-Line Political Discussion? *Information Communication and Society*, 1(3): 313-338.
- Willems, W. (2011). At the Crossroad of the Formal and Popular: Convergence Culture and New Public in Zimbabwe, In H. Wasserman, (2011). *Popular Media, Democracy and Development in Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Williamson, A. (2011). Disruption and Empowerment: Embedding Citizens at the Heart of Democracy: *JeDEM* 3(1): 22-32.
- Wimmer, R. D. and Dominick, J. R. (2003). *Mass Media Research: An introduction: (7th ed.)*. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Wimmer, R. D. and Dominick, J. R. (2011). *Mass Media Research: An introduction: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning*.
- Wolfe, J. D. (1985). A Defense of Participatory Democracy, *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 47, No. 3.
- Wood, C. I., Daley-Moore, N., and Powell, R. (2019). Using Interviewing in Public Health Research: Experiences of Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(10), 2441-2452.
- Wood, H. (2014). No, You Rioted! The Pursuit of Conflict in the Management of “Lay” and “Expert” Discourses on Kilroy, In A.V. Tolson, (2014) ed. *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, performance, spectacle*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wright, S. and Street, J., (2007). Democracy, Deliberation and Design: The Case of Online Discussion Forums, *New Media and Society* Vol 9 (5):849–869.
- Wyatt, R. O., Katz, E., and Kim, J. (2000). Bridging the Sphere: Political and Personal Conversation in Public and Private Spaces. *Journal of Communication*, 50, 71-92.

- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study Research: Design and Methods* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and The Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Younis, T. (1995). The Allende Community Experiment in Empowerment: Participation Too Far? *Local Government Studies*, 21(2): 263-279.
- Ytreberg, E. (2004). Formatting Participation within Broadcast Media Production. *Media, Culture and Society*, 26 (5), 677-692.
- Yuan, E. J., and Thomas. B. K. (2011). The Duality of Structure in China's National Television Market: A Network Analysis of Audience Behaviour. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*. 55. 180-197.
- Zaller, J. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmerman, M. A. (1989). The Relationship between Political Efficacy and Citizen Participation: Construct Validation Studies. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53: 554–566.
- Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment Theory. Psychological, Organizational and Community levels of Analyses. In: J. Rappaport, and E. Seidman, (eds): *Handbook of Community Psychology*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

- Zimmerman, M. A., and Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen Participation, Perceived Control, and Psychological Empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16: 725-750.
- Zimmerman, M. A., Israel, B. A., Schulz, A and Checkoway, B. (1992). Further Explorations in Empowerment Theory: An Empirical Analysis of Psychological Empowerment: *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 6.
- Zittel, T. (2007). Participatory Democracy and Political Participation, in Zittel, T., and Fuchs, D. (2007). *Participatory Democracy and Political Participation. Can Participatory Engineering Bring Citizens Back in?* Routledge, London.
- Zittel, T., and Fuchs, D. (2007). *Participatory Democracy and Political Participation. Can Participatory Engineering Bring Citizens Back in?* Routledge, London.

Website

- BROADCASTING ACT. NO. 4 OF 1999. https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201409/20042gon584.pdf (Accessed, September 2019)
- ICASA. MOTSWEDING FM. Annual Compliance Report, February 2017 <https://www.icasa.org.za/uploads/files/Motsweding-FM.pdf>(14 February /2021)
- SABC Annual Report 2011|2012. <https://www.soscoalition.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/SABC-Annual-Report-2011.pdf> (Access 28 June 2015)
- WAN (World Association of Newspapers and News publishers). 2013. "World Press Trends: Print and Digital Together Increasing Newspaper Audiences." Available from: <http://www.wan-ifra.org/press-releases/2014/06/09/world-press-trends-print-and-digitaltogether-increasing-newspaper-audience>(Accessed March 2, 2017).

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATING IN AN INTERVIEW

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. This study is taken towards the fulfilment of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Communication with North-West University (Mahikeng Campus). The purpose of the study is to examine the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest for citizen's democratic participation with focus on selected programmes namely: *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The information you provide will be treated with strict confidentiality. Do you have any question concerning the study?

Please read and sign the following:

I hereby acknowledge that I have been informed about the nature of the study. I am also informed that the information I provide will be treated with strict confidentiality and can only be used for the purpose of the study and for any other related academic activity such as publication of the findings in a scholarly journal.

I have also been afforded the opportunity to ask questions about the study and therefore declare that I am willing to participate.

Signature

Date

I, Thabo Godfrey Mokgosi, hereby confirm that the above participant has been fully informed about the nature of the study

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FOR TAPE RECODING

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. I would like to make one more request before we start this interview: that we record this interview. I would like to record the interview so that I could be able to get an accurate account of the interaction. This will help me in accurately interpreting and analysing the data. You are free to decide on whether you want it to be recorded or not. Your objection will not negatively affect our relationship.

You are also free to request me to stop the recording at any time during the interview, or ask me to switch off the tape-recorder. Would you like us to record the interview?

(If no), your choice is respected, we can proceed now

(If yes), May you please sign to indicate your consent

Informed Consent for Tape Recording

I understand that the interview is being recorded to facilitate the interpretation and analyses of the data. I have had all the above information explained about how confidentiality will be guaranteed. I am at liberty to ask for the recording to be stopped at any time. I hereby agree to the recording of the interview.

Name of participant

Signature

Date

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR NEWS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS PRODUCER

TSELE LE TSELE

1. How long have you been producing *Tsele Le Tsele*?
2. Which program do you produce?
3. How far does your program provide space in which citizens may debate public issues in a democratic forum?
4. How would you describe the level of citizens (audience) participation in your program?
5. Do you consider news and current affairs programs adequate in providing citizens an opportunity to express their views on current issues?
6. What is your opinion on the program structure in its contribution toward citizen's democratic participation?
7. How often do you engage audience on controversial socio-political matters affecting them?
8. What do you consider the socio-political influence of the issues discussed and debated on your programs?
9. Are there, any political and economic influences in what is debated in your programs?
10. Do you think citizen participation on your program affect influence the political structure of the society?
11. What is your view on 'everyday political talk' among citizens as a component of the 'democratic participation and empowerment'?

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATING IN AN E-MAILED INTERVIEW

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. This study is taken towards the fulfilment of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Communication with North-West University (Mahikeng Campus). The purpose of the study is to examine the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest for citizen's democratic participation with focus on selected programmes namely: *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The information you provide will be treated with strict confidentiality. Do you have any question concerning the study?

Please read and sign the following:

I hereby acknowledge that I have been informed about the nature of the study. I am also informed that the information I provide will be treated with strict confidentiality and can only be used for the purpose of the study and for any other related academic activity such as publication of the findings in a scholarly journal.

I have also been afforded the opportunity to ask questions about the study and therefore declare that I am willing to participate.

Signature

Date

I, Thabo Godfrey Mokgosi, hereby confirm that the above participant has been fully informed about the nature of the study

Signature

Date

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FOR TAPE RECODING/ E-MAILED INTERVIEW

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. I would like to make one more request before we start this interview: that we record this interview. I would like to record the interview so that I could be able to get an accurate account of the interaction. This will help me in accurately interpreting and analysing the data. You are free to decide on whether you want it to be recorded or not. Your objection will not negatively affect our relationship.

You are also free to request me to stop the recording at any time during the interview, or ask me to switch off the tape-recorder. Would you like us to record the interview?

(If no), your choice is respected, we can proceed now

(If yes), May you please sign to indicate your consent

Informed Consent for Tape Recording

I understand that the interview is being recorded to facilitate the interpretation and analyses of the data. I have had all the above information explained about how confidentiality will be guaranteed. I am at liberty to ask for the recording to be stopped at any time. I hereby agree to the recording of the interview.

Name of participant

Signature

Date

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR NEWS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS PRESENTER

TSELE LE TSELE

1. How long have you been presenting this programme?
2. To what degree is your programme engaging the public/citizens/audience in issues of national and local concerns?
3. To what extent do you think your programme shapes public discourse on issues that have just mentioned?
4. How would you describe the level of citizens (audience) participation in your programme?
5. Are citizens able to state whatever is in their mind on your show or are there any limits?
6. How far do you think your programme is able to influence 'political' matters?
7. How often does your programme provide space for citizens to debate/talk about their everyday experiences of life in a democratic society relevant to the empowerment?
8. What is your opinion on the programme structure in its contribution toward citizen's democratic participation?
9. Do you consider news and current affairs programmes adequate in providing room for a pluralistic view on current issues?
10. What is your feeling regarding SABC public radio stations, broadcasting in indigenous languages' ability or inability to provide citizens with an open platform for public debate?
11. In general, what is your view on 'talk show' as a constitutive feature for citizens' democratic participation?

APPENDIX G

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATING IN AN E-MAILED INTERVIEW

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. This study is taken towards the fulfilment of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Communication with North-West University (Mahikeng Campus). The purpose of the study is to examine the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest for citizen's democratic participation with focus on selected programmes namely: *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The information you provide will be treated with strict confidentiality. Do you have any question concerning the study?

Please read and sign the following:

I hereby acknowledge that I have been informed about the nature of the study. I am also informed that the information I provide will be treated with strict confidentiality and can only be used for the purpose of the study and for any other related academic activity such as publication of the findings in a scholarly journal.

I have also been afforded the opportunity to ask questions about the study and therefore declare that I am willing to participate.

Signature

Date

I, Thabo Godfrey Mokgosi, hereby confirm that the above participant has been fully informed about the nature of the study

Signature

Date

APPENDIX H

INFORMED CONSENT FOR TAPE RECODING/ E-MAILED INTERVIEW

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. I would like to make one more request before we start this interview: that we record this interview. I would like to record the interview so that I could be able to get an accurate account of the interaction. This will help me in accurately interpreting and analysing the data. You are free to decide on whether you want it to be recorded or not. Your objection will not negatively affect our relationship.

You are also free to request me to stop the recording at any time during the interview, or ask me to switch off the tape-recorder. Would you like us to record the interview?

(If no), your choice is respected, we can proceed now

(If yes), May you please sign to indicate your consent

Informed Consent for Tape Recording

I understand that the interview is being recorded to facilitate the interpretation and analyses of the data. I have had all the above information explained about how confidentiality will be guaranteed. I am at liberty to ask for the recording to be stopped at any time. I hereby agree to the recording of the interview.

Name of participant

Signature

Date

APPENDIX I

E-MAILED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR NEWS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS

PRODUCER: *BORESETSE*

1. How long have you been producing *Tsele Le Tsele*?
2. Which program do you produce?
3. How far does your program provide space in which citizens may debate public issues in a democratic forum?
4. How would you describe the level of citizens (audience) participation in your program?
5. Do you consider news and current affairs programs adequate in providing citizens an opportunity to express their views on current issues?
6. What is your opinion on the program structure in its contribution toward citizen's democratic participation and empowerment?
7. How often do you engage audience on controversial socio-political matters affecting them?
8. What do you consider the socio-political influence of the issues discussed and debated on your programs?
9. Are there, any political and economic influences in what is debated in your programs?
10. Do you think citizen participation on your program affect influence the political structure of the society?
11. What is your view on 'everyday political talk' among citizens as a component of the 'democratic participation and empowerment'?

APPENDIX J

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATING IN AN E-MAILED INTERVIEW

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. This study is taken towards the fulfilment of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Communication with North-West University (Mahikeng Campus). The purpose of the study is to examine the extent to which *Motsweding* FM broadcast in quest for citizen's democratic participation with focus on selected programmes namely: *Boresetse and Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The information you provide will be treated with strict confidentiality. Do you have any question concerning the study?

Please read and sign the following:

I hereby acknowledge that I have been informed about the nature of the study. I am also informed that the information I provide will be treated with strict confidentiality and can only be used for the purpose of the study and for any other related academic activity such as publication of the findings in a scholarly journal.

I have also been afforded the opportunity to ask questions about the study and therefore declare that I am willing to participate.

Signature

Date

I, Thabo Godfrey Mokgosi, hereby confirm that the above participant has been fully informed about the nature of the study

Signature

Date

APPENDIX K

INFORMED CONSENT FOR TAPE RECODING/ E-MAILED INTERVIEW

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. I would like to make one more request before we start this interview: that we record this interview. I would like to record the interview so that I could be able to get an accurate account of the interaction. This will help me in accurately interpreting and analysing the data. You are free to decide on whether you want it to be recorded or not. Your objection will not negatively affect our relationship.

You are also free to request me to stop the recording at any time during the interview, or ask me to switch off the tape-recorder. Would you like us to record the interview?

(If no), your choice is respected, we can proceed now

(If yes), May you please sign to indicate your consent

Informed Consent for Tape Recording

I understand that the interview is being recorded to facilitate the interpretation and analyses of the data. I have had all the above information explained about how confidentiality will be guaranteed. I am at liberty to ask for the recording to be stopped at any time. I hereby agree to the recording of the interview.

Name of participant

Signature

Date

APPENDIX L

E-MAILED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR NEWS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS

PRESENTER: *BORESETSE*

1. How long have you been presenting this programme?
2. To what degree is your programme engaging the public/citizens/audience in issues of national and local concerns?
3. To what extent do you think your programme shapes public discourse on issues that have just mentioned?
4. How would you describe the level of citizens (audience) participation in your programme?
5. Are citizens able to state whatever is in their mind on your show or are there any limits?
6. How far do you think your programme is able to influence 'political' matters?
7. How often does your programme provide space for citizens to debate/talk about their everyday experiences of life in a democratic society relevant to the empowerment?
8. What is your opinion on the programme structure in its contribution toward citizen's democratic participation?
9. Do you consider news and current affairs programmes adequate in providing room for a pluralistic view on current issues?
10. What is your feeling regarding SABC public radio stations, broadcasting in indigenous languages' ability or inability to provide citizens with an open platform for public debate?
11. In general, what is your view on 'talk show' as a constitutive feature for citizens' democratic participation?

APPENDIX M

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPANTS

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. This study is taken towards the fulfilment of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Communication with North-West University (Mahikeng Campus). The purpose of the study is to examine the extent to which *Motsweding FM* broadcast in quest for citizen's democratic participation with focus on selected programmes namely: *Boresetse* and *Tsele Le Tsele* news and current affairs. The information you provide will be treated with strict confidentiality. Do you have any question concerning the study?

Please read and sign the following:

I hereby acknowledge that I have been informed about the nature of the study. I am also informed that the information I provide will be treated with strict confidentiality and can only be used for the purpose of the study and for any other related academic activity such as publication of the findings in a scholarly journal.

I have also been afforded the opportunity to ask questions about the study and therefore declare that I am willing to participate.

Signature

Date

I, Thabo Godfrey Mokgosi, hereby confirm that the above participant has been fully informed about the nature of the study

Signature

Date

APPENDIX N

QUESTIONARE FOR PARTICIPANTS

Instruction: Tick the Appropriate Box Where Applicable

1. Gender

Male	
Female	

2. Age

20-30	
30-40	
40-50	
50-60	
60 and above	

3. Education

Matric	
Diploma	
Bachelor's Degree	
Honour's Degree	
Master's Degree	
Others	

4. Occupation

Economic Cluster	
Health Cluster	
Safety and Security Cluster	
Education and Social development Cluster	
Others	

5. Income Per Year

R10000-150000	
R150000-200000	
R200000-250000	
R250000-300000	
R300000 +	

7. What is your source of political information?

Broadcast Current Affairs	
Broadcast Political Talk Shows	
Newspapers	
New/ Social Media	
Political Talk with Friends	
None	

8. How often do you listen to political discussion and current affairs?

Never	
Rarely	
Occasionally	
Regularly	
Don't Know	

9. How often do you listen in broadcast political discussions contrary to yours?

Always	
Sometimes	
Seldom	
Never	

10. Do you have the feeling of efficacy to participate in broadcast political discussions with other citizens in public e.g. talk shows?

Yes	
No	

11. Why do you think audience participate in news and current affairs programs?

To get others views	
To express views	
To persuade others	
Develop critical awareness	

12. What is your view on 'everyday broadcast political discussion' among citizens in news and current affairs programs?

High level of engagement	
Transformative	
Confrontational	
Challenges	
No opinion	

13. What do you think motivate audience to discuss political affairs with each other?

Political knowledge	
Political interest	
Political efficacy	
Political tolerance	
Ideological strength	

14. What role do you think current affairs play in society?

To enhance political interest	
To enhance knowledge	
To enhance tolerance	
To enhance forms of political participation	
To enhance political socialization	
Don't know	

15. What is your understanding of broadcast political discussion?

Talking together as citizens	
Persuasion through dialogue	
Expressing personal views	
Get other people's views	

16. To what extent do news and current affairs programmes broadcast on *Motsweding* FM reflect citizen's democratic participation?

To a very large extent	
To a large extent	
To a moderate extent	
To a small extent	
To a very small extent	

17. What kinds of issues are often covered on *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs discussions?

Gender based violence/ Sexuality	
Racial tensions	
Service delivery protest	
Poverty, inequality and unemployment	
Corruption and maladministration	
No Comment	

7. How do you rate the level of audience participation of the issues mentioned above on *Motsweding* FM's news and current affairs?

Empowering	
Disempowering	
No Comment	

8. To what extent do agree with this statement: *Motsweding* FM's current affairs' audience participation segment relevant to empowerment of citizens' in their everyday experiences of life in a democratic society?

Strongly Agree	
Agree	
Undecided	
Disagree	
Strongly disagree	

9. Generally, what is your view of the structure of citizen participation on *Motsweding* FM's News and Current Affairs programmes?

Open Participation	
Managed Participation	
Framed Participation	

APPENDIX: O

Data transcribed and translated from *Tsele Le Tsele* and *Boresetse* Radio programmes, Motsweding FM Archives.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

PROGRAMME THEME: HOLDING OFFICIALS TO ACCOUNT (RRT 06/07/2018)

Reports by Mmmankau Mothoa "Toropopo ya Rustenburg Ke ngwe ya ditoropo di le some tharo goralala Afrika Borwa tse di tlhopilweng ke puso ya bosetshaba go tsenya tirisong ya porojeke ya dipalangwa tsa botlhe ee tokafaditsweng. Thulaganyo le leano la dipalagwa tsa botlhe lo rulagantswe ke lefapha la bosetshaba la dipalagwa le go amogelwa se mmuso ke kabinete digwaga di le lesome le bobedi tse difiteleng. Ka ngwaga wa dichelete wa 2011-2012 mmasepala wa Rustenburg o ne wa simolola porojeke ya go baakanya le go tlhabolola ditsela tsa mo gare ga toropo le tse ditswang ka toropo e le go baakanyetsa mokgwa o o mosha wa dipalgwa tsa botlhe oo itsegeng jaaka Rustenburg Rapid Transport kgotsa RRT. Mokaedi wa namaosatshwere kwa lefapheng la dipalagwa wa mmasepala wa Rustenburg Obed Molele ore fa lemorago la porojeke. (Setswana version)

Reports by Mmmankau Mothoa: The town of Rustenburg is one of the thirteen towns across South Africa which were selected by the national government to embark on public transport project that is fast and efficient. The project and the plan for public transport is organized by the National Department of Transport and officially welcome by cabinet twelve years ago. In 2011-2012 financial year, Rustenburg municipality had embarked on project to maintain and improve intersections which enter and exit town as a way of improving the new mode of public transport which is known as Rustenburg Rapid Transport or RRT. Acting Director of Roads and Transport of Rustenburg Municipality Obed Moleele give us the background of the project. (English version)

Interviewee, Obed Moleele: *Porojeke e ya Rustenburg Rapid Transport e simolotse ka ngwaga wa 2012. Re simolla ka kago ya ditsela mo lokisheneng la rona la Tlhabane go tswa mo toropong ya rona ya Rustenburg. Mme re agile ditsela le ditselana tsa bese. Ra tla gape ra simolola... ratla gape ratswelela ka tsela etswang motoropong e ya Kanana. Mme ga jaana re busy ka tsela tse di motoropong le CBD ya Rustenburg. (Setswana version)*

Interviewee, Obed Moleele: *This project of Rustenburg Rapid Transport started in the year 2012. We started with the construction of roads in our location, Tlhabane from our town Rustenburg. And we have constructed minor and major buses' roads. From there we started...we continued again with the road from town to Kanana. Now we are busy with internal roads which are in town and Rustenburg CBD (English version)*

Reporter: Mmmankau Mothoa: *Go ya ka Moleele legato lantlha la porojeke eno le tshwanetse go ka bo le konoseditswe ka ngwaga wa 2015. Fela go nnile le dikgwetlho di le mmalwa. (Setswana version)*

Reporter: Mmmankau Mothoa: According to Moleele, the first round of this project should have been completed in the year 2015. However, there were several challenges. **(English version)**

Interviewee, Obed Molele: Tota tota mmasepala o simolotse a ikaeletse go simolola ka tsamao ya dibese ka ngwaga wa 2015. Mme golie gwa nna le matsapanyana a irileng re ntse re aga ditselana tseo re nne le ona. Matsapa ao ke o ne a dirileng go re re diege. Matsapa ao a akaretsa construction e e leng gore e tsere sebaka, e leng gore tota re ne re sa ikaelela gore e tseye sebaka jalo. Ka ntlha ya the other services tse di itluuludang metsi le motlakase jalo ...tseo e leng gore they were part of the construction eo e neng e dirwa. Go ile gwa nna gape le some of the various objection tse di dirilweng kgatthanong le mmasepala on town planning tseo e leng gore mmasepala o sa ntse o disekaseka. Gape re ile ra nna le challenge ya gore le fa re na le plan ya gore re aga ditsela tse, madi otlhe ga a tle ka selemo sele sengwe. A tla ka selemo sa ngwaga se o leng gore o nna le madi aa rileng gore o age tsele eerileng. Mme madi ao a ne a sa lekana gore reka aga tsela tse ka nako e lengwe. So re ile ra tshwanelwa ke gore re kgaoganye diporojeke tse re diagang ka ngwaga le ngwaga. Ke tsona thatathata tseo di dirileng gore re diege. **(Setswana version)**.

Interviewee, Obed Molele: Really really the municipality initially started with the intention to start with bus roads in the year 2015. However, we experienced some challenges in the process of constructing those roads. Those challenges contributed to the delay. The challenges include the construction which took long time and really we had no intention to take such a long time. Due to other services which include water and electricity etc...which were not part of the construction which was underway. There were also some of the various objection which were made against the municipality on town planning which the municipality is still examining. Again we had a challenge of...even if we had a plan, the finance doesn't come in one year. It come yearly for a particular project to be completed. That's money wasn't enough to complete the construction at once. As a result, we had to divide the project in terms of each financial year. Those are the challenges which contributed to the delay. **(English version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: Jaanong kgang e ga se ya rona. Ke ya lona baagi. Re batla go fa lona tshono. A re ye ko go lona. Re tle re tseye dipotso le ditshwaelo mo baaging. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: Now this issue is not ours. Its belong to the community. We want to give you the opportunity. Let come to you. We will take questions and comments from the community. **(English version)**

Participant: Justice: Nna I am surprise gore in our meeting we have a PR councilor who is suspended to be also responding to these things. Aa theka mmeyara in this meeting. She is part of the people who are failing us because she sits also ko council le ena. E ne we said it in the past gore or councilors stop addressing us in these meeting because we are being failed before majora a re failure re failowa ke makaselara le di PR. They are supposed to be responding to these things le bona not gore batle go atheka majora in the meeting. A leena a resiponde. She is a PR councilor. I am a former ...e re ke addresser this thing. I am a former chairperson ya steering committee. We ask their ward to bring their steering committee

to us for six month ba refusa. Today she sits here and she wants to attack the major. Failure ya mayara ke failure ya gage. That the honest truth. **(Setswana version)**

Participant: Justice: I am surprise that in our meeting we have a PR councilor who is suspended to be also responding to these things. He/she is attacking the Major in this meeting. She is part of the people who are failing us because she sits also in the council as well. And we said it in the past that or councilors stop addressing us in these meeting because we are being failed before Major fail us, we are being failed by PR. They are supposed to be responding to these things also and not to come and attack the major in the meeting. Let her also respond. She is a PR councilor. I am a former ...let me address this thing. I am a former chairperson of steering committee. We ask their ward to bring their steering committee to us for six months and they refused. Today she sits here and she wants to attack the major. Major's failure, it's her failure. That the honest truth. **(English version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: Mmaetsho ke nagana gore ke go fe tshono gonne kgang ya gore le lona jaaka makhanselara lona le seabe...ao ko o a tumele kwano...jaaka lona makhanselara gore lo tshwanetse lo rwale maikarabelo fa kanselle ya mmasepala wa Rustenburg o feila baagi. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: Madam I think that I should give you an opportunity because this issue of you as councillors contribute...just come closer...you as councilors have to carry the responsibility when the Rustenburg Municipal council fails the residents. **(English version)**

Participant, PR Counselor: Ee retshwanetse ra tsaya maikarabelo...e mare ntate kgang ya go epiwa ga ditsele we raised it in the council. E ne e reisiwa ke ntate Matlhoko to say to the major re ka se epe tsela e yotlhe. Why go sa ipiwe one side go fediwe. Because of their ruling party ba refuositse. **(Setswana version)**

Participant, PR Counselor: Yes, we have to take the responsibility but the issue of digging the roads, we raised it in the council. It was raised by Mr Matlhoko. He said we can't dig the whole roads. Why one side was dug, then complete. Because they are the ruling party, they refused. **(English version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: Ke batla go itse gore jaaka mokhanselara a ga o tseye maikarabelo gonne o karolo ya khansela. Ke potso ya mme. Ao tsaya maikarabelo, ee kgotsa nnya fela? **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: I would like to know as a counselor aren't you take responsibility because you're are part of the council. That's my question. Are you taking the responsibility? Just Yes or No. **(English version)**

Participant, PR Counselor: Ee ke tsaya maikarabelo ntate. **(Setswana version)**

Participant, PR Counselor: Yes, I take the responsibility sir. **(English version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: ke a leboga. Rre Moleele ke go boditse kgantele gore Mme yo o raisa kgang e ke eriisitseng ya gore lo epile toropo e yotlhe instead ya gore le epe side e one, le fetse...ke ne ke bua ka problem, gore selo a ga se problem gore lo kabo lo epile side e one, la fetsa, la ya mo go e ngwe, la fetsa. Mokhanselara a re ba e reisitse ko kanseleng. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *I thank you. Mr. Moleele, I have asked you previously that this woman raise the same issue that I raised that you dug the whole town instead of digging one side, then complete. I stated the problem that isn't a problem that you should have dug one side, then complete and go to the other side and complete. The councilor says, they raised it at the council. (English version)*

Interviewee, Rre Molele: *Ntate ke ya go fela gore ke a ipoeletsa ka gore ke tlhalositse gore tsela...fa o shebella tsela ngwe le ngwe, e re tseneng mo go yona, re tsere the same period. Now ga re ne re diega go dira tsela e one ka nako e le ngwe. Re ne re ya go tsaya gape digwaga go fetsa porojeke e. Go nnile bothokwa thata gore re simolole ka contructions ya ditsela tse re itseng gore ke tsa bese mo selemong sele le sengwe gore re kgone go fetsa. (Setswana version)*

Interviewee, Rre Molele: *Sir, I will finally repeat what I have said that the road...when you look at any road that we have constructed, we spent the same period. Now we were going to delay if we were doing one road at the time. We were going to take years to complete this project. It was really necessary to start with the constructions of what we know that they are for bus in a year in order to complete. (English version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous), *Nna ke kopa kere ke lebogela dibui tsa magodu tsere sa bolong go dibatla tsa ko public safety. (Setswana version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous), *I would to say, we thank the speakers who are thieves which we have been looking for from public safety. (English version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Ee mmaetsho a tumela kwano...a tumela mmaetsho. Ao a itse gore, gore o bitse motho legodu, ke motho oo tshwerweng, a sekisiwa, a bonwa molato? A batho bao ba sekisitswe, ba bonwa molato gore o ba bitse magodu? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Madam come closer...come closer. Do you know that to call a person a thief, it's a person who is convicted, trialed and found guilty? Are these people trialed, found guilty for you to refer to them as thieves? (English version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Ema pele Boitumelo, sa ntsene ganong. (Setswana version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Wait Boitumelo. Do not interrupt while I am speaking. (English version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Mmaetsho... (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Madam... (English version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Ema pele Boitumelo, sa ntsene ganong. (Setswana version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Wait Boitumelo. Do not interrupt while I am speaking. (English version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Mmaetsho.... gago kgona gale gore o ka tla mo, wa tla go bitsa batho magodu. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Madam...it can't be possible that you can come here, to call people thieves. (English version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Se ntsene ganong Ema pele Boitumelo, sa ntsene ganong. (Setswana version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Do not interrupt while I am speaking. Wait Boitumelo. Do not interrupt while I am speaking. (English version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *Gago kgonagale gore o ka tla fa wa bitsa batho magodu. Nkarabe gore a batho ba batshwerwe ba sekisiwa ba bonwe molato. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *It can't be possible that you can come here, to call people thieves. Answer me, are these people convicted, trialed, found guilty? (English version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Bateng baba sekeng. (Setswana version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *There are those who are in trial. (English version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *A ba bonwe molato? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Boitumelo Korogo: *are they found found guilty? (English version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Boitumelo, se ntsene ganong. (Setswana version)*

Participant Lady (anonymous): *Boitumelo. Do not interrupt while I am speaking. (English version)*

PROGRAMME THEME: DYSFUNCTIONAL MUNICIPALITY (19/09/2018) TSELE LE TSELE

The debate was aired following the North West Government Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) decision to put Eight North West municipalities under administration. The decision stems from the department of local government and human settlements diagnosis of the state of municipalities in the province. The affected municipalities were Kagisano-Molopo; Ramotshere Moiloa; Ditsobotla; Kgetlengrivier; Maquassi Hills; Naledi; Mahikeng local municipalities; and the Ngaka Modiri Molema district municipality would be under section 139(1)(b) of the constitution, and section 137 Municipal Finance Management Act with effect from September 1.

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: A re e simololele ka gore Lefapha la Dipuso se Legae mono North-West le rometse setlhophapha sa batsamaise kana administrators kwa dimmasepaleng tseo di sa dirang sentle. Seno setla morago ga tshweetso ya puso ya North West ya go diragatsa Section 139(1)(b) ya molaoteo wa naga mo dimmasepaleng tseo dia a karetsang Kagisano-Molopo; Ramotshere Moiloa; Ditsobotla; Kgetleng rivier; Maquassi Hills; Naledi; Mahikeng local municipalities le Ngaka Modiri Molema district municipality. Gape puso ya porofense ene ya tsenya tirisong section 137 ya Municipal Financial Act kgotsa molawana oo tsamaelanang le tsamaisana ya matlole a tsamaiso ya matlole a mmasepala mo dimmasepaleng tsa Ngaka Modiri Molema, Naledi le Mahikeng. Bontsi jwa batsamaisi bano bakile badira jaaka batsamaise ba dimmasepala tseo di a karetsang Rustenburg, Dr. Ruth Segomotso Mompoti, Madibeng le West Rand. Bona ba a karetsa Eric Matlawe, Mosa Sejosengwe, Thupi Mokgatla, Cebo Tshetlho. Bangwe ga ba a feleleletsa paka tsa bona mo dimmasepaleng tseo baneng ba dira mogotsona mo nakong ee fetileng.

(Setswana version)

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: Let's begin by reporting that the Department of Local Government here in the North-West has issued the list of administrators lead the dysfunctional municipalities. This follows the decision of the North West government of invoking Section 139(1)(b) of the country's constitution in the municipalities that includes Kagisano-Molopo; Ramotshere Moiloa; Ditsobotla; Kgetleng rivier; Maquassi Hills; Naledi; Mahikeng local municipalities and the Ngaka Modiri Molema district municipality. Again the provincial government has enacted section 137 of Municipal Financial Act against Ngaka Modiri Molema, Naledi and Mahikeng. Most of these administrators have previously worked as Administrators in municipalities such as Rustenburg, Dr. Ruth Segomotso Mompoti, Madibeng land the West Rand. They include Eric Matlawe, Mosa Sejosengwe, Thupi Mokgatla, and Cebo Tshetlho. Some of them had not completed their term in those municipalities they were deployed to. **(English version)**

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: Jaaka ke tihalositse mo lemoragong laaka gore bontsi jwa batsamaisi...bale barometseng kwa dimmasepaleng tse di sa dirang sentle bakile badira mo dimmasepaleng mo nakong ee fetileng jaaka basamaisi ba dimmasepala tseo. Goreng le dumela gore batla thusa dimmasepala tseo di sa dirang sentle mo North West? **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: As I have already explained in my introduction that most of the administrators...those you have deployed to the dysfunctional municipalities have previously worked as administrators in those municipalities. Why do you think they would turn around those municipalities which are dysfunctional in the North-West? **(English version)**

Interviewee, Ben Bole: *Ke nnete Thabiso. Ke rata fela go ala phate. Ntette ke tthalose fela ke fetise selo se fela ka bonako gore baagi ba rona le bo mmasepala ba rona ba lemoge gore fa re romela diadministrators ko mmasepaleng ga re ba romele ka ntata ya gore they must go and punish municipality. But re ba romela ka ntata ya gore ba ile go fana ka support mo dimmasepaleng tsa rona ka gonne constitution ya South Africa your section 139 e e tthalosa gore fa oo ka re gona le bokoa mo dimmasepaleng tsa rona, re tla tshwanna, rona re le porofense re table report ko executive council as per the constitution ya gore ke nnete go nna le bokoa mo le. Let's sent administrator to go and help. Ga se gore diadministrator tse di ya ko dimmasepaleng to go and punish or to go and... support go netefatsa gore batho ba neelwa ditirelo. (Setswana version)*

Interviewee, Ben Bole: *It's true Thabiso. I would like to give the background. Allow me to just quickly explain this minor issue so that our community and our municipalities understand that the administrators in municipalities are not just deployed on the basis that they must go and punish municipality. But we deploy them on the basis that they go to offer their support at our municipalities because the constitution of South Africa, your Section 139 explains that when it reasonable look like there are inefficiency in our municipalities, we must, we as the province, to table report at the executive council as per the constitution that its true, there are inefficiencies there. Let's send administrator to go and help. It's not that these administrators go to municipalities to go and punish or to go and...support. To ensure that the community get services. (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *A re ye ko potsong ya ka. Go reng le dumela gore batla thusa dimmasepala tsena re lebeletse their track record? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Lets return to my question... Why do you think they would turn around these municipalities considering their track record? (English version)*

Interviewee, Ben Bole: *Rona re le puso gare kitla re tseya batho ba eleng gore ga bana maitemogelo aa maleba. Re tsaya batho baba nang le maitemogelo aa maleba ka gonne ba ya ko dimmasepaleng go ya go thusa go support go chenja selebego within a short space of time. (Setswana version)*

Interviewee, Ben Bole: *We as government will never deploy incompetent individuals. We deploy individuals with relevant experience because they go to municipalities to support and change the image with the short space of time. (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Rre Sethimbane ko Bapong. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Mr Sethimbane from Bapong. (English version)*

Rre Sethimbane (Caller): *Rre Thabiso. Rre oo tota ga a bue nnete. Boammarruri di adminitrators tseo go tweng dirometswe...ke moagi wa Bapong. Re na le six months re sena metsi mo Bapong, Majakaneng ea a buang ka one, e gona mo Bapong, ga rena metsi for six months. Dithata tsa rona difetogile dintlo..., rre oo ga a bue boammarruri. Batho bao ba re itse fella fa goiwa ditlhopong, ga bana sepe le morafe. (Setswana version)*

Mr Sethimbane (Caller): *Mr. Thabiso...That man is not telling the truth. The truth is those administrators purported to be deployed...I am a resident of Bapong. We have six months without running water in Bapong. The Majakaneng that he is talking about, is in Bapong. We don't have water for six months, our rights have turned into houses...that man is not telling the truth. Those people know us only when we are in the election season. They don't care about the community. (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Rre Sebetlele kwa Brits. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Mr. Sebetlele from Brits (English version)*

Mr. Sebetlele (Caller): *Ka mokgwa oo ke swabileng ka teng, rre oo ke gore fa motho a dira phoso ba a mo shifitisa ba ya go modira administrator. Potso ya ka e one fela. Gore how can you take one e leng gore ona le diphoso tse dintsi o be o ya go moetsa administrator. Mmereko wa mayora ke eng, why o sa tle mo go rona community wa re botsa gore re batla mang? (Setswana version)*

Mr. Sebetlele (Caller): *The way I am so disappointed. That man whenever someone is found to be incompetent, they move him, they appoint him as the administrator. That's I have got only one question. That's how can you deploy someone who is so incompetent and appoint him as the administrator. What's the duty of the major? Why aren't you involving the community to participate in making their choice? (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Thabo Setlhogo kwa Switzreneke. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Thabo Setlhogo from Switzreneke. (English version)*

Thabo Setlhogo (Caller): *Ke batla go tshwaela-ke tle go simolola ka gore...what rre oo a ntseng a se bua gore a itsi gore maikarabelo a politician mo mmasepaleng kana major mo mmasepaleng ke go conduct oversight. Ga se go nna municipal manager, ke go conduct oversight over the administration, not to be the municipal manager ene the municipal manager does not account to the major in particular. He reports to the council as whole. Mme se ke batla go se bua gape rre Moss ke gore diadministrators tseo di palelwang tse ditsentswe mo dimmasepaleng you look at their track record. None of them has performed well. So you ask yourself gore why the EXCO mo Bokone Bophirima, they took a decision of taking those people ba baisa ko mmasepaleng...there is a clear indication ya gore our EXCO mo Bokone Bophirima does not have interest ya go nnetefatsa gore dimmasepala tsa rona di nne stable, it does not have interest ya go nnetefatsa.... actually what they enjoy they enjoy looting ko dimmasepaleng. (Setswana version)*

Thabo Setlhogo (Caller): *I want to comment. I would like to start by saying that...what that man has just said should know that the responsibility of the politician in municipality or the major in municipality is to conduct oversight. It's not to become municipal manager. It's to conduct oversight over the administration, not to be the municipal manager and the municipal manager does not account to the major in particular. He reports to the council as whole. What I would also want to add Mr. Moss is that those administrators that have failed, those who are deployed in municipalities, you look at their track record, none of them has performed well. So you ask yourself gore why the EXCO in the North West, they took a decision of taking those people to the municipalities ...there is a clear indication that our EXCO in the North West does not have interest of ensuring that our municipalities are becoming stable, it does not have interest of ensuring.... actually what they enjoy, they enjoy looting in municipalities. (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Re tshwanetse rafa ba bangwe tshono. Ace. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *We have to give other chance. Ace. (English version)*

Ace (Caller): *Mo North West re tshwere mathata because of go reircle batho. Fa motho a dira phoso fa mo mmasepaleng oo, o isiwa kwa. Re be re expecta dirisult tseo e leng gore di diferente. Rre Bole foo, a ke motlhomamisetse gore, seo ba se dirang dimmasepala...gare kitla o nna le tswhwaello pele. Why ba se ye ko bathong ba ba re ye ba re le batla mang. (Setswana version)*

Ace (Caller): *In North-West we have serious problem because people are recircle. When someone underperform in this municipality, he is taken elsewhere and we expect different results. Mr. Bole there... let me face him...what they are doing in municipalities...there won't be progress. Why aren't they involving the community to make their choice? (English version)*

FaceBook

Participant, Thapelo Matati: *"Potso ya ka ke gore, a gago hiriwe go ya ka ditokomane tsa tiro eo o tla e berekang?" (Setswana version)*

Participant, Thapelo Matati: *"My question is being the decision to employ taken according to one's relevant qualification? English version)*

Participant, Lebethe Phukumusi: *Nna ga ke dumalane le rre Dan Bole ya go tsaya bomeiyara ba pele go ba dira diadministrator. (Setswana version)*

Participant, Lebethe Phukumusi: *I disagree with Mr. Dan Bole...to take the previous mayors to make them administrators. English version)*

PROGRAMME THEME: LAND ISSUES (05/07/18)

The debate took place subsequent thousands of King Goodwill Zwelithini's subjects' gathering at Ulundi, Kwa-Zulu Natal province for a meeting to discuss the issue of communal land. The King made a controversial statement when threatening to protect the Zulu people's land at all costs. The pretext for the meeting was perceived in the context mobilizing resistance to proposals that the Ingonyama Trust Act be revisited in order to ensure it does not infringe on the rights of those citizens who live in area under its jurisdiction. The meeting came amidst the report of the Parliament's High Level Panel led by former president Kgalema Motlanthe which was widely interpreted to effectively mean the expropriation of the Ingonyama Trust's land without compensation. The report which, among other things, recommended that Ingonyama Trust be dissolved appear to have stirred fear among certain sector of society.

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Minister Lamola we maybe... let's before we take listeners...lets me first ask this question quickly. We know that currently the parliament constitutional review committee...they are continuing on the possible amendment of section 25 of the constitution to allow for expropriation of land without compensation. In relation to what has been happening during these public hearing, are there are you not concern that the land issue is now... it seems to be dividing the country along colour and ethnic lines?*

Interviewee, Minister Lamola: *it is not dividing people. I have attended, I think three of the hearing. One in Mable Hall in Limpopo, an another in Mbobela Nelspruit and another part of Mpumalanga. And what I have seen is that people are making contribution. Although you can see that contribution come from the type of colour but also a class issue. Its related to how people are related to the land. For example, you hear farm workers say: we reside in this land, we work in this land, we want to have access to this land, we are being evicted from time to time. So we being abuse in our farms. So it is on the basis of class relations to the land. Those that are white will raise the issue that there is no need and so forth. But it is also because of their class relations to the land on the basis that most of them are property owners or land owners. But you also hear majority of black people in mining communities like in the Middleburg yesterday and I suspect it might be the same in some parts of North West where they raise that mine, they also evict them and the community become divided on the question and so forth. And these issues have to be discussed. They have to be confronted, we must find the resolution where all South Africans can find a common heritage, common share holding...sharing of the land and they must feel that they are also having an opportunity to contributing to the economy because the majority of young people who participate are young. They were very clear that the need the land for farms, they need it to unlock the economic opportunities, not only for farming but also they can reside or where they can start small business. And majority of women where raising an issue that where they are working the land, they don't have the security of tenure, anyone can come and evict them. Their security of tenure is not guaranteed when they are working the land. So you can see that whoever comes, come with the contributions. They want to unlock the economic opportunities, they want the country to work for everyone black and white, young and old.*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Let's take listeners to either to ask question or make contribution.*

Dr Mmolawa (Caller): *I don't know gore ke tribal kana ke eng...ba kgobokantse group ya batho ba ke kaba bitsang gore ke MaZulu, ba ikgobokantse gore puso ga se yone e tshwanetseng...ga e laole lefatshe and understanding ya ka, puso e le nosi fela... Ke puso ya ANC. Now there need gore batho baba government batsena ko trust ingonyama go sheriwe lefatshe le. We are not saying letswe mo magosing. We are simply saying...if e le gore o kereye lefatshe le le tonna jaana, a magosi otlhe mo diporofenseng a fiwe mafatshe a kanaka a trust engonyama enang le ona. (Setswana version)*

Dr Mmolawa (Caller): *I don't know whether its tribal or what else. They have organized a crowd of people whom can be named Zulus. They have organized themselves...that the government isn't suppose. it's doesn't have control over land and my understanding is, the government alone...the ANC led government. Now there is a need that government interfere with this Ingonyama Trust so that the land could be even distributed. We are not suggesting that it should be taken away from traditional leadership. We are simply saying...if he gets such a huge share of the land, all traditional leadership in all the provinces should equally get land equivalent to Trust Ingonyama too. (English version)*

Nxethile (Caller): *Ba ya go dirang ka lefatshe la ka Kwa Zulu-Natal. Jaaka ke utlwa go tse ho sofiwa. (Setswana version)*

Nxethile (Caller): *What are they going to do with the land in Kwa Zulu-Natal, as I hear that they will be war. (English version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Most of our listeners or two of the callers that we have got...they are raising the issue of Ingonyama trust and the Zulu King who wants Ingonyama Trust to remain intact. Have you been...maybe been misunderstood as particularly to traditional leaders. How are you responding to the issue in particular?*

Interviewee, Minister Lamola: *That issue is look at comprehensively with all communal land. As you might have heard when I started. I said we will look at all the communal land, including the one that belong to Ingonyama Trust. It will not be looked at in isolation, and there is no specific target or focus on Ingonyama Trust. But it's the whole governance of the communal land across the country.*

FaceBook Comment:

Participant, Olebogeng Kgoroba *"Ruri Kgang ya lefatshe e nkama maikutlo. Ke ne ke solofetse fa lefatshe le tla tsewa mo dia atleng tsa basweu le go busetswa bantsho ka le thopilwe mo go bona. Jaanong fa e le gore section 25 e tobane le go amogwa le bantsho lefatshe ka maikaelelo...seo ga se tarabollo ee ke neng ke e solofetse. (Setswana version)*

Participant, Olebogeng Kgoroba *"Really, the land issue touches me deeply. I thought the land would be expropriated from the control of whites return back to the Africans since it was forcefully seized from them. That's not the solution I was expecting. (English version)*

PROGRAMME THEME: SOCIAL DEBATE 10/08/2018 (HUNDRED MATCH/ TOTAL SHUTDOWN)

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Mme re tsena mo kganyeng ya rona mo maistiboeng ano. Mme re simolola ka gore, banna ba le dikete bane ba gwanta kwa Pretoria kgatlhanong le tshotlo ya basadi le bana. Kgabagare ga se batho ba le bantsi ba ba emang nokeng mogwanto ono. Zizi Skhozana go tswa mokgatlhong wa Total Shutdown a re mogwanto ono oo bidiwang Hundred Men Match e ne e le maitamako, kgotsa ba ba batla go tlhagelela mo bo bega dikgannyeng. **Liela Magnus** o rula gantse kgan eno ee tlang ka **Dimpho Gopane**. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Now let's get to our topic of the day this evening. We start by reporting that about thousands men were matching in Pretoria against Gender-Based-Violence and Children abuse. However, not many people supported this match. Zizi Skhozana the organization Total Shutdown says this match called Hundred Men Match was just press publicity. **Liela Magnus** compiled this news report presented to you by **Dimpho Gopane**. (English version)*

Dimpho Gopane (Producer): *Banna ba le dikete bakgobokane mo mosong kwa toropong ya Pretoria kgatlhanong le tshotlokako ya basadi le bana. Bane ba emetse maphata a otlhe a baagi go a karetsa le dikereke. (Setswana version)*

Dimpho Gopane (Producer): *Thousands of men came together this morning at Pretoria against Gender-Based-Violence and Children abuse. They represented various sectors of society. (English version)*

Impromptu Interviewee 1, While Abaju: *"I am representing the Culture of Muslim Theologian known as.... South Africa. As religious leaders, I think it is imperative that we are present here today to voice our concerns against abuse against gender violence".*

Impromptu Interviewee 2, Nikiwa Rikhotso from Evangelical Presbyterian Church in Pretoria, Tshwane: *"I am the secretary of the Men's Gift. We're here to come and support the good cause because we have realized that the issue of women abuses and children abuse...those are serious issues that are affecting the country".*

Impromptu Interviewee 3, Jabu Baloi from Non-Governmental Organization known as Commission for Gender Equality. *"This has gone too far. Women cannot leave under the shadow of us men as rapist, as perpetrators, as abusers because it is not women who are abusing themselves. That it is an acknowledgement...it is indictment on us"*

Impromptu Interviewee 4, Mark Kington (SARS Acting Commissioner) *"it is important issue for us as society that we are seen as men to be standing up against women and children abuses. That's why we are here today as an organization"*

Impromptu Interviewee 5, Daniel Steinberg *"women and children are the backbone of our society and I come from the house where my mother and sisters were abuse physically and emotionally by my father and since pass that I think it is the worthy cause because women are the backbone of the nation and we have to love and support them, not only just one day but for 360 days, 24/7"*

Impromptu Interviewee 6, Bheki Cele (Police Minister): *it is the epitome of the government and this department that women children must be safe so when they come to the police we must understand that they are not just visiting there, it is because there is pressure. If you send them back home to negotiate, next time she might not come back because she is dead. It's not your duty as SAPS member to send women back to negotiate. Yours is to arrest"*

Impromptu Interviewee 7, Pamla Williams (Acting Government Communication and Information System Director General) *"You know...I think all of us acknowledge we have a crisis in this country with abuse of women and children. I think these are part...members of our society who are also protected by this constitution. So we are raising an awareness...particularly to say if you are men out there who are battling with the relationship, it is still ok, you can still get help, we are saying any woman out there... that's why we are partnering with the media...a woman who is sitting there in the relationship that is abusive, who doesn't know whether there is map way out, we are hoping this awareness is going to assist us"*

Impromptu Interviewee 8, Ziki Skhosana (Total Shutdown): *"We are not matching with them because they are not for us, they are for themselves...the glory actually ...I mean the erasure of trans...women gender people is quite apparent and I mean why else would not for the women not saying enough is enough"*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Re tsena mo kgannyeng e re e lebellang maitsiboeng eno, ee keegileng ka ona mogwanto o wa go mpieno jaaka o tlhotse o tswelletse kwa Pretoria. Mme o rulagantse ke ba lefapha la tlhaeletsano la puso kana GCIS. Re ya go buisana le bone tebang le ntlha eno go ya pele. Re tla tsaya mogala wa gago mo 0898602233. Re a itse gore mogwanto ono o tla ka nako e leng gore ntlha ee amang go sotlwa ga basadi le bana e le tlhoba boroko mo Afrika Borwa jaaka o gopola dingwe tsa dikgetse tse di etsegetseng thata, tse ditlhageletseng, tse dibontshang go sotlakakiwa ga basadi le bana monageng. Mme re golagana le Rre Keitumetse Semakane go tswa kwa GCIS tebang le mogwanto wa kajeko oo mabapi le go soltakakiwa ga basadi le bana monageng. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *We start with focus on the main news story of the day this evening which focus on the same match of today as it unfolded in Pretoria. The match is organized by Government Communication and Information System or GCIS. We will talk to them concerning this issue. We will take your calls on 0898602233. We know that this match take place at the time when this issue of Gender-Based-Violence and Children abuse has become a thorn in the flesh in South Africa if you may recall some well publicized related cases that took place, which demonstrate Gender-Based-Violence in South Africa. We talk to Mr. Keitumetse Semakane from GCIS concerning today's match against Gender-Based-Violence and Children in South Africa. (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Lone lo ikaelela go fitlhelelang ka mogwanto o wa gompiano kwa Union Building kgotsa Pretoria o e le gore o kgatthanong le tshotlakako ya basadi le bana? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *What did you intend to achieve with today's match at Union Building or Pretoria which is against Gender-Based-Violence and Children abuse. (English version)*

Interviewee, Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *Maikaelelo a rona Rre Thabiso Moss e ne e le gore re golagane le go tsibosa setshaba ka ka karetso. Bothata bo ba tshotlakako ya basadi le bana, e le gore re romele molaetsa oo siameng tota, o totobetse wa gore re le puso re ema kgatlhanong le go sotlakakiwa ga basadi le bana mo e leng gore mo bofelong tota go isa kwa goreng basadi kgotsana makgarejwana a felelwa ke botshelo. Mme re ne rere banna ba botlhe ba itlame, ba romele molaetsa o o tletseng wa gore re tshotlakako kgatlhanong le tshotlakako ya basadi le bana go. (Setswana version)*

Interviewee, Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *Our intention Mr. Thabiso Moss was to connect and create awareness to the nation as a whole. This problem of women and children abuse, being that we convey really good message, which is real, that as government, we stand against women and children abuse which ultimately really lead to the point where women or young women end up dead. Then we were saying let's all men commit, convey complete message that stand against women and children abuse. (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *A molaetsa o gorogile? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Is the message well received? (English version)*

Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *Re tseya gore molaetsa o gorogile rraetsho. Boidiidi jo bo neng bo le teng gompiano bo re bontsha gore batho ba tsibogetse boikuelo ba rona, e bile ga ba o bo tsibogela fela, e leng gore basupe le go netefatsa gore totatota sotlakakiwa ga basadi le bana ke selo seo e leng tlhoba boroko mo pusong le mo setshabeng. Ga one o kabo o le teng ga re simolola mo mosong wa gompiano ka 10:00 ke boidiidi jo boning bo le teng, mme le batho ba botlhe bane one o kgona go bona le molaetsa o baneng ba o romela. Banna le basadi bane basupa gore tota gore ba sekegetse tsebe boikuelo e bile ba batla go romela molaetsa oo. (Setswana version)*

Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *We hope that the message is received. The multitudes of people who attended to day indicate that people are responding to our call. And they did not just respond to our call, they really demonstrated that women and children abuse is troublesome to the government and the nation. If you were there when we start this morning today at 10: 00, the multitudes were present, includes those people you could see the message they were conveying. Men and women showing that the really heeded to our call and wanted to send that message. (English version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Mme molaetsa o, ke mang oo neng o mototile le gore molaetsa o fitlhile ko go ene, fa re lebeletse mengwe ya maitlhommo a le neng lo ikemiseditse go a fitlhelela? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Who are the target audience, has the message reached them, when we glance at some of the intentions you aim to achieve. (English version)*

Interviewee, Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *Molaetsa rraetsho one o labile setshaba ka kakarestso, mme segolo se tonna o rometswe go borre, kana banna bao bona ba ikimiseditseng gore tota batla sotla bana le basadi. Kana tota Thabiso ga re lebella, ga se banna ba botlhe ba e leng gore badira selo seo, tota maikaelelo ene e le gore re ise molaetsa ko go ba eleng gore...badirile jalo gogwe ka go tlhoka kitso le gore banna le basadi ke batho baba botlhokwa ka thata mo setshabeng gore ba seka ba sotlakakiwa ba bone*

molaetsa o, ba o utlwe, fa e le gore maikaelelo a ne a le teng ba tswe o mo maikaelelong oa. Mme gape le setshaba ka kakaretso re ba bontshe gore tshotlakako ke tlhoba boroko mo pusong. Mme e bile go ya ka molaoteo wa rona ga se selo se o leng gore se siame. Mongwe le mongwe o tshwanetse go phela ka kgolollosego mongwe le mongwe a phele a phutulogile, go sena gore le fa a le mo relationshiping kgotsa a le kae, mo gae kgotsa mo tirong kgotsa ko kae. O tshwanetse a nne ka phuthulogo, a sa tshoge gore kana fa ke a sotliwa, kana fa go ka nna gwa diragala gore botshelo jwa me bo tsamae. **(Setswana version)**

Interviewee, Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *The messages sir was targeted to the nation as a whole, but especially target to men or the men who are deeply committed to women and children abuse. Thabiso, when we look really, it's not every man who do this thing, really the aim was to convey the message to those who...did that or perhaps due to ignorance or lack of knowledge that men and women are important human beings in society, to stop abusing...to see this message, to hear it, if the aim was hidden, they should abandon those aims. Again the nation as a whole, we should show them that violence is nuisance to the government. And according to our constitution, it's not tolerated. Everyone is entitled to live freely... every one live with hindrances, whether in the relationship or elsewhere...home or at work or elsewhere. He/she should live freely, without fear of being abuse or his/her live being treated with death.* **(English version)**

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *A mogwanto o ya go thusa mo goreng basadi le bana ba seka ba sotlakakiwa mo nageng, kgotsa re bone ntlha e ee kete go a fokotsega, kgotsa go nne le boitarabologelo bongwe jo borileng?* **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: *Is this match going to assist in ending women and children abuse in the country, or to see the situation whereby this issue comes down or certain degree of consciousness being raised?* **(English version)**

Interviewee, Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *maikaelelo ke ona ao Thabiso gore mokwa o wa go sotliwa ga bana le basadi o fokotsege. Re a itsi gore re ka seka ra fedisa tshotlakako ya basadi le ban aka mogwanto o le mongwe, kgotsa ka puo e le ngwe. Ga se mogwanto wa ntlha, go nnile le e mengwe ee fitileng mme bothata jo bontse bo tswelletse. Jaanong mme rona re ne rere regatelle, re netefatse, re ipoeletse re ira gore batho ...molaetsa o tsene, o tsenelle mo go bona e tle e re gongwe ga nako e ntse e ya batho ba go utlwe, gore selo se setle kwa bokhutlong. E ne jaaka fa ke buile Thabiso totatota go bo tlhoko mo basading, go botlhoko mo baaging, go botlhoko le mo pusong go bona bana ba bigisiwa, go bona basadi ba bogisiwa, mo eleng gore tota ko bofelong e be ebile ba felelwa ke matshelo a bona. Jaanong selo seo re tshwanetse go ema ka dinao re le setshaba re le ke gore re lemose batho, re lemose banna gore selo seo se tle kwa bokhutlong* **(Setswana version)**

Interviewee, Rre Keitumetse Semakane: *That's the intention Thabiso to bring down this thing of women and children abuse. We know that we can't end women and children abuse with the one match, or only the government. It's not the first match, there have been matches in the past but the problem persists. However, we were simply emphasizing, trying to ensure, repeating ourselves making sure that people...the message get through...its cultivated among them so that maybe in future they may be aware... so that this thing come to pass. As we have mentioned Thabiso, really really its painful among women, painful among the nation, it's painful even to us government to see children being abuse, to see women being abuse to the*

point where eventually lead to their death. Now we must stand on our feet as a nation, to create awareness to men so that this thing come to the end. **(English version)**

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: Some a mabedi le borataro marago fela ga ura ya borataro (18:23). Moeng warona ke Rre Keitumetse Semakane go tswa GCIS lefapha la tlhaeletsano la puso. Re bua le bone, batlhotse ba rulagantse mogwanto gompiano o o kgatlhanong le tiriso dikgoka kgatlhanong le batsadi le bana... a re utlwe gore o reng mo 0898602233. Ntle le fao, dipotso le ditshwaelo tsa gago di goroga ko tsebeng ya FACEBOOK ya dikgang@motswedding. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Thabiso Moss: its twenty-three past six (18:23). Our guest is Mr. Keitumetse Semakane from Government Communication and Information System or GCIS. We're talking to them. They organized the match today who is against the abuse of women and children. Let's hear you on 0898602233. Besides that, questions and your comment arrives at our FACEBOOK being dikgang@motswedding. **(English version)**

Meshack Sono (Caller): Rre Thabiso Moss ene e kete...ke kgatho e ntle thata e puso ee tsereng. E ntle thata thata...mme fela ke ne ke ka itirela boikuelo...gore e kete puso e ka tsaya this thing ya simololala go e e baya go ya ka diporofense. Mme segolo se tonna, e re fa ba itsisa mo diporofenseng babo bae baya mo diwekenteng ka gore o tla e la tlhoko gore borre ba le bantsi ba a bereka mo gare ga beke. **(Setswana version)**

Meshack Sono (Caller): I think... it's a good step that the government is taking. It's really really good. But I would like to make a plea...that government should take this this...take it from one province to the next. More importantly, when they bring it to the provinces, it should be during the weekends because you will realize that most men work during the week. **(English version)**

Ace (Caller): Ke batla go raya Rre fao ke re, a seka ya re ga abuse e dirwa ke Ace le mme, re be re bua, mare fa e dirwa ke motho yo mongwe oo o tsegalang o tlhagellang kana celebrity re bo re didimala. The only way eo re yang go fenya selo se mo Afrika Borwa ke go bua ka go lekana mo bathong ba botlhe, go sa kgathalesege gore a motho ke celebrity kgotsa jang. Fa re ka tsewe ka go lekana ba rotlhe, tsatsi lengwe re ya go fenya selo se. **(Setswana version)**

Ace (Caller): I would like to say to Sir there, that it should not be that when the abuse is committed by Ace and the partner, we make noise. But when its committed by known person or celebrity, we then keep quite. The only way we are going to triumph over this thing in South Africa is to equally speak about all, without their social standing. If we can be treated equally, one day we will end this thing **(English version)**

BORESETSE: A MOTSWEDING FM RADIO ARCHIVES

The legal framework of Rape and Sexual Harassment issue was debated on Boresetse news and current affairs in August 24th 2018 episodes in an interview with law expert Mr Joseph Modise. The guest emphasis the element of consent as it relates to engaging in sexual activity being an agreement between two parties. The discussion undertook to eliminate societal misconception of thinking of thinking that the fact of being in a relationship, married or otherwise means partners have blanket consent to engage in sexual activity. The presenter began by painting a horribly vivid picture by highlighting gender base violence cases that attracted media, by extension, public attention.

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Africa Borwa e ntse gakgamaditswe ke ditiragalo tsa sesheng tseo diamang basadi bao e nna batswa setlhabelo ba ditiragalo tsa dikgetsi tsa go betelelwa le tshotlo. Tiragalo ya go ipolaya ga moituti wa university ko Rhodes kwa Eastern Cape Khensani Maseko e ne ya utlisa baituti ka ene ga mmogo le botsamaisi botlhoko morago gago lemoga fa Maseko a ipolaile ka ntlha ya petelelo ee modiragalatseng ka kgwedi ya Motsheganong. Go tlhageletse fa Maseko a beteletswe ke lekau la gagwe leo e leng moituti kwa Rhodes University. Sesheng go ntse le tiragalo eo mosha wa mono Mahikeng a fitlhetsweng a tlhokafetse kwa Unit Nine mme setopo sa gagwe se ne se sa apara. Mme go belaelwa fa beteletswe. Fela potso e nna gore ke eng se se tlotlheletsang ditiragalo tsa go betelelwa ga basadi. Mme re tla be re tlhologanya gore molao tebang le molao wa rape and sexual harassment.... Rre Modise boresetse. A re lebogetse fa rena le wena mo Motseding FM. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *South Africa has recently been experiencing the surge of repeated acts of victimization of women who turned to become rape victims and violence. The incident of committing suicide by Rhodes University from Eastern Cape, Khensani Maseko has deeply hurt fellow students and parents after they discover that Maseko committed suicide due to rape events against her on May. The investigation revealed that Maseko was rape allegedly by her boyfriend who is a fellow student at Rhodes University. Recently, a youth was found dead in Unit 9 here in Mahikeng and her corpse was naked. It is suspected that she was raped. Nevertheless, the question is what causes rape against women. We try to understand what the law say concerning the law on rape and sexual harassment...Mr. Modise good morning. We welcome you on Motswedding FM. (English version)*

Interviewee, Joseph Modise: *Boresetse Fifi le bareetsi ba Motswedding FM. (Setswana version)*

Interviewee, Joseph Modise: *Good morning Fifi and Motswedding FM listeners. (English version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Releboge thata rre Modise mme a tle re simolole puisano ya rona ka gore molao fa o tlhalosa petelelo, o e tlhalosa jang? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *We thank you Mr. Modise, let's begin our conversation by asking the question; what is the legal explanation of rape? (English version)*

Interviewee, Joseph Modise: *Petelelo Fifi le bareetsi e tlhalosa jaaka thobalano ee kwa ntle ga molao, unlawfully and intentionally intercourse with a female without consent. Ke yone definition ya rape mo nageng ya rona ya afrika borwa. Gore go ne gona le maikaelelo e le selo se e leng gore seo se dirileng seo se kwa ntle ga malao. Ga se amogelesege le motho kwa ntle ga maikaelelo or kwa ntle ga tumalano ya*

gagwe. Because lefoko le le botlhokwa foo ke gore go tshwanetse ga nne le tumalano. Fa go sena tumalano gona, ke kgang...seo re ka se bitsang gore gona le petelelo. (Setswana version)

Interviewee, Joseph Modise: *Rape Fifi and the listeners is explained as 'unlawful sexual intercourse', unlawfully and intentionally intercourse with a female without consent. That's the definition of rape in our country South Africa. That's there was intention that what you have done is done against the law. It's against the law with a person without her/his intention or without his/her consent. The most important word to note is that there must be consent. If there's no consent, it's a problem...that can constitute rape. (English version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Go ngwe tla re lebelele mo ntlhe ya ga Khensani Maseko. Morago gago amogela dipego tsa go ipolaya ga gagwe ka ntlha ya petelelo ee e diragetseng ka kgwedi ya Motsheganong gone ga tlhagelela dipego tsa gore o peteletse ke le kau la gagwe e leng moithuti kwa Rhodes university. Re tlhalosetse gore molao o reng fa go na le kgolagano ya go gore motho o ke ratanang le ene, kana o ke nyalaneng le ene o ka kgona go ntatofatsa ka petelelo? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Lets perhaps look at Khensani Maseko's case. After receiving the news of her death as a result of suicide on May, it was established that she was raped by her boyfriend who is the student at Rhodes University. Explain to us what the law says when there's relationship, in particular the person whom I am in sexual relationship or someone whom I am married to, can they too open a rape case against me? (English version)*

Interviewee Joseph Modise: *Mo kgang ya ga re simolola go bua ka petelelo...re tshwanetse re itse, ore ke itlhalose ka gore, gore go nne le thobalano between the two parties, selo se se botlhokwa sa ntlha, go tshwanetse ga nna le tumalano. Fa go sena tumalano, go raya gore the other party ga a ka a batla go robalana le o mogwe go sena tumelano. Go raya gore golo foo go ntse le tiriso dikgoka kana gona le phoso. Jaanong that's why kere the key word foo e nna consent. Ga go sena consent and wa robala le motho kwa ntlhe ga tumalano ya gagwe, o tshwanetse wa itse gore... gago reye gore fa o le lekau kana le nyalane go ka se nne le rape. Petelelo e nna fela fa go sena tumalano magareng ga batho ba ba bedi. . (Setswana version)*

Interviewee Joseph Modise: *When we begin to talk about rape...we must know that or let me explain it this way...in order for sexual intercourse to take place between the two parties, first and foremost, there must be consent. Without consent, it means that the other party has not given consent to have sex with the other without consent. That means force was applied or a bridge of the law. That's why I say the key word is consent. Without consent and you have a sexual intercourse with someone without his or her consent, you must know that...being a boyfriend or being in the marriage, there won't be a rape. The rape is committed if there's no consent between two people. (English version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Tla ke tlhaloganye gape fa re modise. O tlhalosa gore go tshwanetse ga nna le tumalano...fa go nnile le tumalano mme gogwe fa re tswelletse, o mongwe wa rona a bo a re a go e misiwe foo, o mongwe a tswelela, a seo le sona se ka tsewa jaaka petelelo? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Lets also understand here Mr. Modise. You explain that there must be consent. If there was consent and when we are in action, and the other party sudden withdraws consent, and the other continues, can that be regarded as a rape? **(English version)**

Interviewee Joseph Modise: E sala e le petelelo because remember fa le simolola one o fane ka tumalano kana consent. Now ga that act e tsweelela o bo o re e misa ga ke sa tlhole ke batla go tswelela pele ka selo se. Ga the other party e ne a tswelela, e fotoga go nna rape because o mo kopile go e misa, mme ene a tswelela...re sa le mo kgang e ya rape gore re tlhologanye rape, the definition of rape is being broaden. It is no longer ga monna a tsenye bonna jwa gagwe mo mosading jwa motho. Go na le go nna gape gore o ka tsenya object mo bosading jwa motho. **(Setswana version)**

Interviewee, Joseph Modise: it remains rape because...remember when you stated one agree or gave consent. Now when that act is on motion, and you say stop, I am no longer interested in continuing with this. When the other party continues, that turns into rape because you asked him/her to stop but he/she continued. While still on this issue of rape, to ensure that we understand rape, the definition of rape has been broadened. It is no longer when a man penetrates his penis into a woman's vagina. There could be penetration of an object into the person's virgin. **(English version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Mo kamanong ya lerato gogwe le ka mo kgolaganong ya motho mo lenyalong go ne go buiwa ka dicontuakal rights. Re thuse go tlhologanya gore dicontuakal rights keng fa go tliwa mo ntlheng ya thobalano le petelelo. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: In any sexual relationship, we talk about conjugal rights. Help us understand what are conjugal rights as it relates to sexual intercourse and rape. **(English version)**

Interviewee Joseph Modise: Conjugal rights mo lenyalong...fa re tlabe re nyalane Fifi, nna le wena kgang e tla be e nna gore nna le wena re monna le mosadi. Re nyalanang re le monna le mosadi, go raya gore go na le tsona ditshwanelo tseo, kana thobalano ee tshwanetseng gonna teng e re e tsayang jaaka conjugal rights. Mo nakong ee fetileng gone gona le molao wa gore, kana molao o ne o tlhologanya gore the moment nna le wena re nyala go raya gore re...throughout ga gona gore o ka tla wa re ke ga ke a dumalana go nna le thobalano kgotsa nnyaa. Now molao o sa le watla wa changiwa ke Prevention of Family Violence o sa le o re le fa re nyalane, re le ka mo lenyalong go ntse le tsona conjugal righttseo. The moment go sena cosent ya the other party, it will be rape. It cannot be that the moment ke go nyala now even if o sa batle gone now in terms of our law even if o sa batle...even if o le mo lenyalong gago reye gore now because o mo lenyalong ga o sa tlhole ona le ditshwanelo. You can do anything that is against your wish. If o sa batle gore that thing e diragale o sa batle gore that intercourse should take place, the moment you say 'no' your wish should be respected because if it is not respected, ke be ke dira something contrary to what you're saying that qualify as a rape. **(Setswana version)**

Interviewee Joseph Modise: Conjugal rights in marriage...when we are married Fifi, me and you the issue will be that we are husband and wife. Being married as husband and wife means that there are those rights or sexual intercourse must take place that is regarded as conjugal rights. In the past, there was a law of, or the law understand that the moment we get married means that...throughout there won't be you can say yes to sexual intercourse or no. Now, the law was changed by the Prevention of Family Violence, it state

that even if we are married, we are in marriage, there were those conjugal rights. The moment there is no consent from the other party, it will be rape. It cannot be that the moment I marry you, now even if you're not willing now in terms of our law, even you are not willing, even if you are in marriage, that does not mean now because you're in marriage you no longer have rights. You can do anything that is against your wish. If you don't want to have that thing to take place, you don't want that intercourse should take place, the moment you say 'no' your wish should be respected because if it is not respected, and I do something contrary to what you're saying that qualify as a rape. **(English version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Re itse Rre Modise fa go buiwa thata ka ntlha ya petelelo, go buiwa go lebeletse mosadi thata. Ke kopa gore o re thuse go tthaloganya gore molao o sireletsa jaang monna oo beteletsweng. Gogwe gona le tiragalo ya gore o beteletswa ke monna o mongwe kgotsa mosadi oo beteletsweng ke mosadi o mongwe jaaka re itse rena le dikgolagano tsa marato magareng ga mosadi le mosadi, monna le monna. Re thuse gore molao o sireletsa jaang ditiragalo tsa mofuta o. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: We know Mr. Modise that when we speak of rape, we focus especially on women. I would like to ask you to explain to us how does the law protect the man against rape. Perhaps there might be an incident where he is being rape by another man or the woman is being raped by the another woman. As we know that we have relationships between men and men and equally between women and women. Helps understand how the law protect this kind of relationship. **(English version)**

Interviewee Joseph Modise: Mo nakong ee fitileng... definition kana protection ya rape e ne e lebetse fela ka mo letlhakoreng la borre ba betelela bomme. Re lebetse gore go a kgonagala gore borre baka betelela borre ba bangwe. Now that's why kere the definition ya rape now e ile ya tshwanelwa ke gore e gole or e broadeniwe. So rre o kgona go betella rre o mongwe because penetration is not only ga e diragal mo bosading jwa motho, e kgona gore e diragale gape mo anus...anus penetration fa ke ka e baya jalo. Now borre b aba kereyang segolo bo tona jang...tse o kereyang re fitlhela ko toronkong, dicorrectional service gore borre ba beteletse borre ba ba ngwe le yone e...it qualifies as rape. Bomme le bona ba kgona go betella. Ke ka moo ke neng ke tthalosa early on that the moment there is penetration or the moment o tsenya any object mo bosading jwa motho, that's qualify as rape. Even if mme o mongwe a ka tsaya any object a e tsenya ka mo bosading jwa o mongwe or even ka mo anus...anus penetration mo mothong wa mme, it will qualify as a rape. **(Setswana version)**

Interviewee Joseph Modise: in the past...definition or protection of rape focus on the side of men who rape women. Forgetting that it is possible for men to rape other men. Now that's why I say the definition of rape had to be widened or expanded. So a man can rape another man because penetration is not only when it happens into women's virgin. It can also happen in the anus...anus penetration if I can put it that way. Now men who found especially.... especially found in jail, correctional services that men rape men...that to...it qualifies as rape. Women too can rape. That's why I early explained that the moment there is penetration or the moment you put any object in a person's virgin, that's qualify as rape. Even if another woman may take an object and put into another's virgin, even in the anus...anus penetration in a woman, it will qualify as a rape. **(English version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: A e re pele re amogela bareetsi rre Modise, re fitise sengwe fa ka ntlha ya sexual harassment. Gore a gona le kgonagalo ya gore tiragalo ya petelelo e ka golagangwa le sexual harassment ee ka tswang e diragetse pele ga tiragalo ee ya petelelo? **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Before we go to the listeners Mr. Modise, lets quickly talk about sexual harassment. Is there a relationship between the act of rape and sexual harassment which might have preceded this act of rape? **(English version)**

Interviewee Joseph Modise: E na le gona gore e ka golagangwa le sexual harassment ee ka tswang e diragetse pele ga petelelo. Re tshwanwa ke gore re tlhaloganye gore sexual harassment e ka tswa... ore e ka mina, go tshwaratshwara motho wa whether wa mme kgotsa wa mosadi a sa batle ka ntlhaya tumelano ya gagwe. Go etsa dicomment...ore o etsa ditshwaelo tse e leng gore...ditshwaelo ga o di etsa o bontsha motho oo gore o batla go tsena mo thobalanong le ena, dilo tse e leng gore o kereya mo e leng gore ga motho a le ka gogo raya a re ga ke rate ditshwaelo tsa gago tse o di e tsang, o tswelle o di etsa. Tsotlhe tseo dikgona gore ko bofelong jwa letsatsi dilidele to yona kgang ya rape. **(Setswana version)**

Interviewee Joseph Modise: There is a possibility of that relationship between the act of rape and sexual harassment which might have preceded this act of rape? We must understand where sexual harassment originates or what it means...to touch a person whether female or women without her consent, to make comments or to insinuate thing that...comments when made imply to a person that you want to enter into sexual intercourse with him/her. Things that you find that when a person attempt to say I don't like your comments...that you're are making, you continue to make. All these have the potential of leading to rape at the end of the day. **(English version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Tla re amogele Oupa Modisane kwa Koster. Dumela Rre Modisane. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Lets welcome Oupa Modisane from Koster. Greetings Mr. Modisane **(English version)**

Modisane (Caller 1): Potso ya me go ntate ke gore go bonolo kana go thata go le go kana kang go profa case ya rape kwa court segolo jang fa go ne go sena dipaki? **(Setswana version)**

Modisane (Caller 1): My question to the man is how easy or difficult is it to prove rape case in court especially where there were no witnesses? **(English version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Re a leboga Rre Modisane. Sebetlele ko Brits. Boresetse. **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: We thank you Mr Modisane. Sebetlele in Brits. Good morning. **(English version)**

Sebetlele (Caller 2): Nna kena le potso ee nyane fela. Fa e kare ke tsena ko police station, ke bo ke re ke beteletse ke mosadi, a gona le gore baka kgona go ncheka jaaka fa ba tlhola basadi? **(Setswana version)**

Sebetlele (Caller 2): I have just a question. When I arrive at the police station, report that I have been raped by a woman, is it possible that I could be examined in the same way the woman is examined? **(English version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Re a leboga Sebetle. Tebogo Seroke kwa Cokonyane. Boresetse. (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *We thank you Sebetle. Tebogo Seroke from Cokonyane. Good morning.*

Tebogo Seroke (Caller 3): *ke kopa go botsa Rre Joseph fao jaaka fa a tlhalosa melao ee yotlhe. Justice system ya rona mo nageng, is it very week gago tliwa mo goreng bopaki botla bo neetswe mara case e bo e tsaya nako e telelele gore e fele go sa tsewe maikutlo a motswa setlhabelo tsia. (Setswana version)*

Tebogo Seroke (Caller 3): *I would like to ask Mr. Joseph as per his explanation of all this laws. Our justice system in the country is very week when to the evidence being given but the case end up taking long time before judgement without considering the victim's feeling. (English version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *We really thank you Mr. Seroke. Meshak Sono from Bareseba. Good morning. (English version)*

Meshak Sono (Caller 4): *Nna ke bona puso fa e tla ka mo ntlheng e ya molao wa petelelo, e gatakile thata ditshwanelo tsa borre ka gore o tla ela tlhoko gore ka mogwa oo Rre Modise a neng a tlhalosa ka teng go thata thata. O ka sere fa o le mo maikutlong a jalo le motho wa mme a bo a go raya a re, ema. Ga o sa kgone ka ntlha ya go laolwa ke maikutlo a gago, e bo e felelets a e nna go re ke rape. O ya emelela, o ya kwa mapodiseng, o ya tshwarwa. Jaanong borre ba ba ntsi...molao ao gatakile ditshwanelo tsa bona. Ba ya go felela kwa dikgolegolong. (Setswana version)*

Meshak Sono (Caller 4): *I view the state when it comes to this issue of rape, seriously violating men's rights because you will carefully realize in the way Mr. Modise early explained, it's really really a challenge. It's a challenge to stop whenever you find yourself in such feeling with a woman. When you fail due to being overwhelmed with such feelings, then it turns into rape. She stands, she goes to the police, you get arrested. Now most of the men...the law has violated their rights. They will end up in prisons. (English version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *Re a leboga thata rre Meshack Sono. Rre Modise a ke go neele tshono ya go ka tsibigela dipotso tseo. Meshack Sono a re Molao o gataka thata ditshwanelo tsa borre ka ntlha ya go ka palelwa ke go laola maikutlo a bona ka nako eo. Gore go dirwa jang? Tebogo Seroke o tlhagisa ntlha ya bopaki jo bo nyelelang, gore gogwe le ntlha ya ga Oupa Modisane kwa Koster, gore go nna bonolo kana go nna thata janng go ka prova ntlha ya petelelo fa go sena bopaki jo bo lekaneng. A borre le bona bana le jaaka bomme ka nako ya fa ba bega kgets a ya petelelo ba tlholwa le go ka dira diteko tse di riling. A borre le bona baneelwa tshono eo? O tsibogela jang dipotso tsa bareetsi? (Setswana version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: *We really thank you Mr. Meshack Sono. Mr. Modise let me give you the opportunity to respond to those questions. Meshack Sono says the law serious violate men's rights dues to failure to contain their feeling during that time. What do we do? Tebogo Seroke expresses concern pertaining to missing evidence including the Oupa Modisane's issue from Koster of how easy or difficult is it to prove rape case in court when the evidence is lacking. is it possible that I could be examined in the same way the woman is examined? Are men given that opportunity? How do you respond to listeners' questions? (English version).*

Interviewee, Joseph Modise: Potso ya ntlha ya gore, go bothata jang gore kgetsi e ka proviwa kwa Kgotla-Tshekelo ya ga rre Modisane ko Koster, ke ka sere go bothata gore kgetsi ya petelelo e ka proviwa in the court of law ka ntlha ya gore for any case to succeed in the court of law, go tshwanetse go nne le bopaki. Bopaki jwa teng, e nne bopaki jo bo tlhomameng. Fa gona le bopaki jo botlhomameng le fa e le gore gone go sena dipaki, ka ntlha ya gore nako ngwe a kere gonna le dipaki, nako ngwe ga gona dipaki...mare fa gona le bopaki jo bo tlhomameng...motswasetlhabelo...kana the perpetrator...I mean, o ka kgona gore a bonwe malato as long as motswasetlhabelo a kgona go testifaya, a fane ka that evidence ee leng gore evidence e ya gagwe e tlhomame. Ga a ete a icontradicta. That's exactly what happen so mo go tseo, a ka kgonwa gore a bonwe molato. Kgang e nna gore a bomme...borre ba kgonwa go tlholwa jaaka bomme ba tlholwa fa baile go bega kgetsi ya rape. Ga ntsi ga motho a ya go bula kgetsi ya rape selo se se etsiwa ke medical check gore e tlhole gore a ke nnte goile ga nna le tsona dipenetration tseo, jalo le jalo. So borre le bona ga e le gore ntho... seo se se tlabeng se e ditswe e tla bo e le rape...anus e e tsegetse jalo. Didactor... bas a ntse ba tsile go tsewa le bona ba e siwa ko ngakeng. Ngaka e tlhole gore a ke nnete go nnile le penetration jalo le jalo. Ngaka e complete medical report. Ga e fetsa go complete medical report, that medical report e romelwa go nna part of the evidence ee tla dirisiwang ko court. E tla nna mo doketeng. Kgang ya ga Rre Seroke ya gore a justice system ya rona e bokoa kgotsa nnyaa ka ntlha ya gore bopaki bo phela bo tsamaya. Ke ka sere justice system e bokoa because remember re na le unit tse pedi. Re na le investigation unit, e bile rena le prosecution or the court. Now fa bopaki bo tsamaile ona le yona tshwanelo you need to go back to the police station, o batle go tlhologanya gore now ka ntlha ya gore bopaki.... bakgone ba go tlhalosetse gore ke eng se ba se batlang se e leng gore ga seo, gore case ya gago e tsamaye e prosecutiwe so that o kgone o ka kgona go bona gore at the end of the day case ya gago e busetswe mo rolong gore e tsaye e ye go sekwa. Kgang ya ga Rre Meshack ya gore molao o gataka ditshwanelo tsa borre that aka ntho ya gore o kile a tlhlosa gore e tla bo o tswelletse go bo gotwe ema...therefore molao o gataka ditshwanelo tsa borre. Ke ka sere malao o gataka ditshwanelo tsa borre ka ntlha ya gore sengwe le segwe se tlhoka gore...especially when there are two parties involved, re tlhoka gore gonne le tumalano. The moment go sena tumalano, it means ga gona agreement and ga re sena agree, ga gona gore go ka tla ganna le sexual intercourse because go tshwanetse go nne le consensual. Fa e le gore two parties ga ba dumalane go raya gore o tla bo a tswella o dira that against the will ya o mogwe, go raya gore o gataka ditshwanelo tsa o mogwe. Therefore, it qualifies as a rape. **(Setswana version)**

Interviewee, Joseph Modise: The first question about how challenging is it for the case to be proven in court from Mr. Modisane in Koster, I won't say it's difficult for the rape case to be proven in the court of law the reason being that for any case to succeed in the court of law, its evidence should be convincing. If there's convincing evidence, even if there were no witnesses, because sometimes there are witnesses', sometimes there are no witness...But if there's convincing evidence...the victim...or the perpetrator...I mean...he/she could be convicted as long as the victim is able to testify, be able to give that evidence, his/her evidence that is convincing. He/she doesn't contradict himself/herself. That exactly what happen. So in all these, you can be found guilty. The other question is, are women...the men be able to be examined just like women being examined when reporting rape case. In most instances, when some go to open rape

case what is done is medical check to establish if penetration did take place and so on. So men too, if what happened...what happened is rape...anus happening like that. The doctors...they will still be taken too to the doctor. The doctor will examine whether penetration took place and so on. The doctor then complete medical report. When he/she complete medical report, that medical report is taken as part of the evidence that will be presented in court. It will be put into the docket. Mr. Seroke's issues concerning that our justice system is weak or evidence keep on missing. I won't say the justice system is weak because...remember...we have two units. We have an investigation unit as well as the prosecution or the court. Now when evidence has disappeared, you have that right, you need to go back to the police station, to find out why now that evidence...so that they can explain to you what is it that they will be looking for that is missing so that your case can go on prosecution so that you can...you can be able to see that at the end of the day your case is back on the roll so that it can trialed. The issue that the law seriously violates men's rights raised by Mr. Meshack due to the fact that while you find yourself in action, then you are asked to suddenly stop...therefore the law violates men's rights. I won't say the law violates men's rights because everything need too...especially when there are two parties involved, we need to ensure that there's agreement. The moment there's no agreement, it means there's no agreement and if we don't have agreement, theirs is no way we have sexual intercourse because there must be consensus. When the two parties do not agree that means you will be continuing do that against the other party's will. That means you're violating the other party's rights. Therefore, it qualifies as a rape. **(English version).**

PROGRAMME THEME: STATE CAPTURE 20/08/2020

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Gompieno go simolala ka ditheetso tsa komishene ee batlisisang ka tshosometso ya ditheo tsa private mo go tsamaiseng puso. Komishene eno e theilwe ke presidente ya maloba Jacob Zuma, morago ga magatwe a itshunyo nko y aba lapa la ga Gupta mo tsamaisong ya puso. Go ne ga tlhagelela fa Motlastsa Tona wa moloba wa matlotlo, Mcebisi Jonas a ne a tshepisiwa go neelwa R6 000 000 go nna tona. Jonas o ne a tlhalosa fa a ne a gana madi ao. Leloko la palamente la maloba Vytjie Mentor le ene o ne a senola tse dingwe tsa ditiragalo. Motlastsa Tona wa maloba wa matlotlo o ne a dira kgatiso e o mo go yone a neng a tlhaloso ka seo balapa la ga Gupta ba neng ba leka go se dira ka maikalelo a go dira kgwebo ee sa kgorelediweng mo pusong. Jonas o ne a tlhalosa jaana: **(Setswana version)**

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Today is the beginning of The Judicial Commission of Inquiry into Allegations of State Capture which investigate allegations of the influence of private institutions into the running of the affairs of the state. This commission was established by the former President, Jacob Zuma following the allegation of the Gupta's family's influence in the running of state affairs. It was reported that former Deputy Minister of Finance, Mcebisi Jonas was promised to given R6000000 to become the Minister. Janas testified that he rejected that bribe. Former member of parliament Vytjie Mentor also reveal some of the allegations. Former Deputy Minister of Finance has done a recording that explains what the Gupta's family attempted to do by entering in an uninterrupted business contract with the state. Jona explained as follow: **(English version).**

(Sound Bite) I have decided to respond to and clarify certain questions that have been in the public domain recently. I do so in accordance with my conscience, my political values and the best traditions of my organization, the ANC, of which I have been a member since my early teens. I regard our Constitution as being sacrosanct and it embraces the values that South Africans struggled for, and what we live by. I was appointed Deputy Minister in terms of the Constitution by the President of the Republic. Any practice that conflicts with the prescripts of the constitution must be challenged in the interest of our democracy and the accountability we have to our people. The ANC that we have been and continue to be proud members of, has offered us the opportunity to serve our country, an honour that I do not take for granted. My historical commitment to the liberation of our people has not waned. The narrative that has grown around the issue of "state capture" should be of concern to all responsible and caring South Africans, particularly those of us who have accepted the task to lead our people. We cannot afford to ignore the obvious impact these sentiments may have on our country and the resultant potential of undermining our moral authority. Neither can we afford to allow the attempts to capture the state to divert us from dealing with the challenges that our country faces. History will judge us on the extent to which we have stayed true to the commitments we have made to our people through our public pronouncements and private conduct. Therefore, let me state the facts on the matter of whether I was approached by nongovernmental individuals in respect of the position of Minister of Finance. Members of the Gupta family offered me the position of Minister of Finance to replace then Minister Nene. I rejected this out of hand. The basis of my rejection of their offer is that it makes a mockery of our hard earned democracy, the trust of our people and no one apart from the President

of the Republic appoints ministers. Let me also place it on record that there was no discussion between the Deputy Secretary General of the ANC Ms. Jessie Duarte and myself on this matter. I have hesitated to speak out publicly on this matter until now, but I feel it is no longer possible to remain quiet. Of primary concern to me is that this issue has a real danger of diverting attention away from the real and urgent challenges we face as a country.

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: Yo ke motlatsa tona wa matlotlo, wa maloba, Mcebisi Jonas, fa a ne a dirile kgatiso eo a neng a tlhalosa gore ba lapa laga ga Gupta ba ne ba le ka go mofa chelate go tsena mo boemong jwa tona ya maloba ya dichelete, Nhlanhla Nene. Mme jaanong potso ya rona ke gore, ao tiile moko gore diphithelole tsa commission eno ditlile go ka salwa morago le gore bao ba tshwanelwang go ka sekisiwa batla isiwa dikgotla tshekelo? *(Setswana version)*

Presenter, Refiloe Seboko: That's Deputy Finance Minister, the former, Mcebisi Jonas, while explaining what the Gupta family in an audio recording of an attempted to bribe him to replace former Finance Minister, Nhlanhla Nene. Now our question is how confident are that the findings of this commission will be implemented and those who must be prosecuted will be taken to court? *(English version).*

Thabang (Caller 1): Nna kgaitadiaka oo tseba ke eng, ke iposta ntho tse ngatha. Go na le dienqueueari tse ngata tse di itsegalang. But after tsona ga gona anybody oo tshwarang ore go na le batho baba e ditseng poso. So le state capture re ntse re tiile go bona the same thing, e ntse e tsegala. Ya gore go bile gwa nna le state capture enquiry, battle batho, batle go testify. After that what happened? Nna ke bona fela e le tshenygo ya tax payers' money. *(Setswana version)*

Thabang (Caller 1): To me my sister, you know what, I am asking myself so many questions. There has been so many inquiries that have taken place. But thereafter, no one is arrested or anybody is found wanting. Even state capture, we still going to see the same thing, continuing to happen. That there was a state capture enquiry, people came, they came to testify. After that what happened? I view it as a waste of Tax Payers Money. *(English version).*

Tshepo (Caller 2): Ke na le tshepo ee tletseng gore dilo di tsile go tsamaya sentle. Ke a leboga. *(Setswana version)*

Tshepo (Caller 2): I have full confidence that things will go well. I thank you *(English version).*

Neo (Caller 3): O a itsi nna Fifi dienqueueey tse di ntapisitse ka modimo. Di ntapisitse ka gonne as Aubuti a buile gore ga gona sepe seo re tlileng go se bona, ka gonne gona jaanong go biditswe e ene mopresidente, ntate Jacob Zuma gore a tle le ene gore bolelela gore go dira getseng ka state capture. A tota o ka bitsa motho oo implicated go tla go re fa bopaki. *(Setswana version)*

Neo (Caller 3): You know to me Fifi, in the name of God, I have heard enough of this inquiries. I have heard enough as my brother has already alluded there's nothing that will come out of this because right now the president has been called, Mr. Jacob Zuma to testify as to what happen with state capture. How can you really called the person who is implicated to testify? *(English version).*

Madikong (Caller 4): Tota this time around ke dumela ka botlalo jwa pelo ya me. Re tlile go bona batho ba ba amegeng ba feta ko dikgotla tshekelo ba ya go seka, go ruta ba bangwe ba ba sa ntse ba isa letsogonyana le le leswe thotong tsa setshaba gore... fa o utswile madi a setshaba...jaanong ke ne ke re go a bonala gore ka mo Aferika borwa a setseng a utlwaletse ka bobudu le corruption kateng, Judge Zondo le lekgotla la gagwe, le botlhe mo Afrika borwa batlile go leka bo jotlhe gore dintlha tse difitlhegileng ditswele ka ko ntle. **(Setswana version)**

Madikong (Caller 4): Really this time around, I agree wholeheartedly. We will see those implicated being trialed, as a deterrent to those who still want to engage in act of corruption relating to state resource to...that when you have stolen state resources...now I was saying it clear the way South Africa has heard with corruption, Judge Zondo and his commission, to all in South Africa, they will try to unearth the secret to the open. **(English version).**